100th Congress
1st Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

CSCE
100-1-10

BASKET III—IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FINAL ACT OF THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE: FINDINGS ELEVEN YEARS AFTER HELSINKI

REPORT

SUBMITTED TO THE

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

BY THE

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND
COOPERATION IN EUROPE

MARCH 1987

Printed for the use of the Commission on Security and
Cooperation in Europe

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
69-823 WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

J 892-11

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

Steny H. Hoyer, Maryland, *Chairman*
Dennis DeConcini, Arizona, *Co-Chairman*

Dante B. Fascell, Florida
Edward J. Markey, Massachusetts
Bill Richardson, New Mexico
Edward Feighan, Ohio
Don Ritter, Pennsylvania
Christopher H. Smith, New Jersey
Jack F. Kemp, New York
John Edward Porter, Illinois
Frank Lautenberg, New Jersey
Timothy Wirth, Colorado
Wyche Fowler, Georgia
Harry Reid, Nevada
Alfonse M. D'Amato, New York
John Heinz, Pennsylvania
James McClure, Idaho
Malcolm Wallop, Wyoming

Executive Branch

Hon. Richard Schifter, Department of State
Vacancy, Department of Defense
Vacancy, Department of Commerce

Commission Staff

Samuel G. Wise, Staff Director
Mary Sue Hafner, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel
Jane S. Fisher, Senior Staff Consultant

Blackburn, Barbara, Admin. Asst.
Brown, Meredith, Staff Asst.
Burns, Deborah, Office Mgr.
Cosman, Catherine, Staff Asst.
Davidson, Lynne, Staff Asst.
Deychakiwsky, Orest, Staff Asst.
Finerty, John, Staff Asst.
Hand, Robert, Staff Asst.
Ingram, Judith, Staff Asst.
Jacobs, Jesse, Staff Asst.
McNamara, Ronald, Staff Asst.
Oliver, R. Spencer, Consultant
Steinhorn, Leonard, Press Officer
Warner, Thomas, Printing Clerk

CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER ONE-HUMAN CONTACTS 1
Bulgaria 1
  Introduction 1
  Emigration, Family Reunification and Binational Marriages 1
  Family Visits and Travel for Personal and Professional Reasons 2
  Travel and Tourism 3
Czechoslovakia 3
  Introduction 3
  Reunification of Families 5
  Binational Marriages 5
  Religious Contacts 6
  Family Visits 6
  Travel for Personal and Professional Reasons and Tourism 7
German Democratic Republic 8
  Introduction 8
  Access to Missions 10
  Reunification of Families 10
  Binational Marriages 11
  Religious Contacts 12
  Family Visits 12
  Travel for Personal and Professional Reasons and Tourism 13
Hungary 14
  Introduction 14
  Family Reunification 15
  Family Visits 16
  Travel and Tourism 17
  Religious and Other Contacts 19
Poland 19
  Overview of Trends Since 1982 19
  Passport Laws and Regulations 20
  Family Visits and Other Travel for Personal and Professional Reasons and Tourism 22
  Family Reunification 23
  Binational Marriages 25
  Religious Contacts 25
  Trade Union Contacts 25
  Access to Missions 26
  Mail Delivery and Telephone Communication 26
  Conclusion 27
Romania 27
  Introduction 27
  Reunification of Families 28
  Binational Marriages 29
  Religious Contacts 29
  Family Visits 30
  Travel for Personal and Professional Reasons 31
  Tourism 31
Soviet Union 32
  Introduction 32
  Family Reunification and Emigration 33
    Laws and Regulations 33
    Procedures and Practices 33
    Soviet Jews 37

Page

CHAPTER ONE-HUMAN CONTACTS—CONTINUED
Soviet Union—Continued
Family Reunification and Emigration—Continued

Soviet Germans 38
Soviet Armenians 38
Pentecostals 38
Other Soviet Nationalities 39
Bilateral US-Soviet Cases 39
Binational Marriages 40
Religious Contacts 41
Family Visits 43
Soviet Visits to United States 43
Rules and Procedures 44
Visits to the USSR 45
Travel and Tourism 46
CHAPTER TWO-INFORMATION 48
Introduction 48
Overview of Trends Since 1982 49
Dissemination and Exchange of Information 51
Oral Information 51
Printed Information 53
Newspapers and Periodicals 53
Books 56
Filmed and Broadcast Information 59
Film 59
Television 61
Radio 69
Cooperative Efforts in the Field of Information 71
Working Conditions for Journalists 74
Conclusion 82
CHAPTER THREE-CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES 82
Introduction 82
Cultural Exchanges 83
Soviet Union 83
Bulgaria 85
Czechoslovakia 86
German Democratic Republic 87
Hungary 87
Poland 88
Romania 89
Educational Exchanges 89
Conclusion 91
FOOTNOTES AND SOURCES 93
APPENDIX 97
Statistics on Emigration from the USSR 97

CHAPTER ONE—HUMAN CONTACTS

Bulgaria

INTRODUCTION

Bulgaria's record on human contacts falls far short of its Helsinki commitments. Emigration, although provided for by law, rarely is permitted. However, the Bulgarian Government occasionally permits members of divided families to join relatives in the West. While the United States has had some success in resolving divided family cases, a small number of cases remain unresolved. A large number of family reunification cases between Bulgaria and Turkey are related to Bulgaria's forced assimilation campaign against the Turkish minority; the Bulgarian Government has refused to deal with these cases. Foreign travel is extremely restricted, although some travel is permitted for family visitation.

EMIGRATION, FAMILY REUNIFICATION AND BINATIONAL MARRIAGES

Bulgaria has shown few improvements in implementing the Human Contacts provisions of the Final Act and it remains highly restrictive in this area. The laws and regulations governing emigration and practices have not changed significantly since the last implementation report in August 1982. Although emigration is possible under Bulgarian law, few get out. To be permitted to emigrate, a person must be released from Bulgarian citizenship, fulfill several obligations to the state and local authorities, and acquire a number of documents, including an emigration passport and exit visa.

Bulgaria's practices in granting permission to leave have been largely unchanged since the signing of the Final Act. The emigration process is complex and information on the process is not widely available. To be released from Bulgarian citizenship, for example, a prospective emigrant must forward a written request to the Ministry of Justice accompanied by 14 separate documents. Visa applicants encounter numerous bureaucratic problems when they apply for passports and exit visas which require a large number of supporting documents. Local officials process travel documentation arbitrarily and issue exit visas only after a delay of months or years.

Prospective emigrants often are denied promotions, new jobs, and educational opportunities. Persistent applicants have lost their jobs or have found themselves banished to small, provincial towns or villages. Recent college graduates who attempt to emigrate without first fulfilling a mandatory 3-year period of service to the state at an assigned job are required to reimburse the state for their tuition and stipend, as well as for the uncompleted portion of their service obligation. Since 1985, this period has been extended to 5 years for physicians just graduated from medical schools. Also, there are reports that the Bulgarian authorities have attempted to extort money for consideration of family reunification cases.

The Bulgarian Government refuses to permit the emigration of members of the Turkish minority, including many family reunification cases, despite a 1985 offer by the Turkish Government to accept them. Ethnic Turks expressing interest in emigrating have been threatened with forcible resettlement to other parts of the country.

While general emigration levels to the United States remain low (several dozen annually), the Bulgarian authorities have taken some positive steps since the previous implementation report to resolve bilateral family reunification cases, particularly within the last 2 years. Between February 1985 and March 1986, the Bulgarian Government resolved 16 out of 24 family reunification cases presented by the US Government, including several longstanding cases. Most of these cases involved immediate family. In late March 1986, a few weeks before the convening of the Bern Human Contacts Experts Meeting, the Bulgarian Government promised to resolve 8 out of 12 divided family cases on the US Embassy's representation list. The remaining four remain unresolved. As of February 1987, there were 5 unresolved family reunification cases involving 8 individuals on the US Embassy's representation lists.

Compliance in the area of binational marriages is generally good. Generally, emigration is allowed to a citizen who, with the permission of the Government, has married a foreigner. The Bulgarian authorities do not officially discourage such marriages, but obtaining the necessary approval is a cumbersome process and some applicants are not permitted to marry foreigners. The number of marriages between US and Bulgarian citizens ranges between 10 and 20 annually. As of February 1987, there was one unresolved US-Bulgarian binational marriage case.

FAMILY VISITS AND TRAVEL FOR PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL REASONS

Bulgarians who apply for permission to visit relatives in the West encounter a system which is arbitrary and heavily bureaucratic. Occasionally, they experience harassment during the application process and sometimes after the visit. The authorities may deny passports and exit visa applications without explanation. Rarely are entire families allowed to travel abroad at one time. Political considerations are an important criterion in determining who can visit family members in the West. Families of defectors or anti-regime activists are usually refused permission to visit.

Since the assimilation campaign began Bulgaria has ceased issuing passports valid for travel to Turkey and virtually no ethnic Turks have left Bulgaria legally. No family visits to Turkey are permitted.

Between 700 and 800 Bulgarian citizens annually have visited their relatives in the United States since 1982. In the year ending October 1, 1986, the US Embassy in Sofia issued over 700 visas for family visits. As of February 1987, there were nine family visit cases on the US Embassy in Sofia representation list.

The Bulgarian record on visits of US citizens to relatives in Bulgaria has been mixed since the Commission's 1982 Implementation report. While most applicants are granted permission to visit, they often face difficulties in obtaining permission to stay with relatives. For this reason, many westerners are compelled to stay in hotels rather than with their family.

TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Travel to the West by Bulgarian citizens is carefully controlled, and it is limited largely to those traveling on official business. The number of Bulgarians traveling to the US in the past 3 years has stayed consistent—around 1,500 Bulgarians annually (this number includes official travel, family visits and tourism). Passports are issued arbitrarily, often after an applicant has waited months or years. Bulgarian citizens applying for unofficial travel must provide an affidavit of support from their US relatives when they apply for a passport and exit visa. Usually older citizens visiting relatives often face bureaucratic problems and delays. According to the State Department's 18th Semiannual Report: "The delays sometimes appear arbitrary, and some administrative units appear more willing to issue the necessary documents than others." Applications are often refused on the grounds that "it is not in the interest of the state" or "not suitable given the present international situation." Bulgarians are permitted to make only one trip every 2 years to a Western country. Very few Bulgarians are permitted to visit the United States solely for tourism as opposed to family visitation. Those traveling on B-2 visas for reasons other than family visitation are usually quasi-official, such as sportsmen participating in competition. Even when rare permission is granted for tourist travel to the West, members of the immediate family, in the vast majority of cases, must remain in Bulgaria.

Bulgaria maintains a relatively favorable climate for Western tourists for it values the hard currency they bring in. There are no formal exchange requirements but hotels generally require hard currency. Tourists may visit most of the country except frontier regions.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

INTRODUCTION

The Czechoslovak record on human contacts both within Czechoslovakia and outside of the country remains mixed. Neither the regulations governing freedom of movement nor the authorities' practices have changed significantly during the period in review. The country's performance on resolving binational marriage cases is good in general, as is its performance concerning many family visits in Czechoslovakia. However, former citizens encounter great difficulties in obtaining visas to visit relatives in Czechoslovakia. And while theoretically Czechoslovak citizens can travel abroad every 3 years, families almost never are permitted to travel together.

Czechoslovak regulations stipulate that authorities must respond to all applications for exit permission within 30 to 60 days of submission. But often the process is prolonged well beyond 60 days. Reported sanctions against would-be emigrants include demotion in employment, educational discrimination and repeated interrogations, particularly for those citizens who seek to emigrate on grounds other than those of family reunification.

The rate of officially sanctioned Czechoslovak emigration is very low. However, the low numbers in this area are balanced by the estimated 10,000 Czechoslovak citizens who leave the country on tourist visas and apply for asylum in the West each year.[1] Tiny numbers of Czechoslovak citizens succeed each year in fleeing across the border into Austria or West Germany, on foot, by airplane and balloon, and by other daring means.

Others have attempted without success to cross the border and paid dearly. In October 1984, Czechoslovak guards followed a Czechoslovak citizen, 25-year-old Frantisek Faktor, fleeing across the border into Austria, and shot him dead. In June 1985, two Czechoslovak citizens were prevented from crossing over into Austria after one was shot (and possibly killed). Just how many cases of failed escapes occur each year is unknown.

One way in which the Czechoslovak regime has dealt with dissidents is to force them into exile, stripping them of their citizenship. For example, in March 1983 Stanislav Adamek, a Charter 77 activist and son of Czechoslovak religious activist Josef Adamek, was stripped of his citizenship and expelled from the country. And in 1986 Jan Hajek, son of Charter 77 activist Jiri Hajek, was compelled to renounce his Czechoslovak citizenship in order to continue his education in Norway. Some Czechoslovak dissidents, even if given the opportunity, do not dare travel abroad for fear of being prevented from returning to their homeland. Authorities use forced exile most often to rid the country of ex-prisoners.

In May 1986, Charter 77 sent a report on Czechoslovak impediments to human contacts to the Bern CSCE Human Contacts Experts Meeting. The document noted that Czechoslovak citizens sometimes are prevented from meeting with foreign visitors, and cited the authorities' use of surveillance against Charter 77 signatories during the visits of dignitaries from West Germany and Austria.

In July 1986, Charter 77 spokespeople and other signatories were prevented from meeting US Senator Larry Pressler during his visit to Prague. Most recently, on separate occasions in February 1987, several Chartists, including playwright Vaclav Havel, were prevented from meeting US Deputy Secretary of State John Whitehead and CSCE Commission Chairman Steny Hoyer, as well as a high-ranking British official.

The Charter 77 document also brought up the problem of communicating with foreigners living either in Czechoslovakia or abroad. In Czechoslovakia, such communication often is interpreted as the sharing of state secrets. The document stated, "Keeping things secret has become one of the principles of official life . . . Because the line or limit between the secret and public is unknown publicly, the citizens opt for not talking with journalists at all."[2] In this area, the Czechoslovak authorities have succeeded in silencing at least some critics of the regime by circumscribing significantly the range of permitted contacts with foreigners. Others who have regularly visited embassies or communicated with embassy personnel have been charged with espionage.

Other citizens' contacts with foreigners, including family members both within and outside of Czechoslovakia, are adversely affected by the internal regulations of the institutions in which they work. Some institutions require prior consent from the director for meetings with foreigners, as well as subsequent reports on the meetings. Charter 77 offered as an example the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, where each employee is required to obtain prior consent from the head of his or her Academy institute to join international scientific organizations or to publish any article abroad. Such restrictions necessarily impede scientific endeavors, which often depend on international cooperation and the exchange of ideas.[3]

REUNIFICATION OF FAMILIES

Generally, immediate family members (parents, children and spouses) of foreign citizens are allowed to emigrate. However, married sons and daughters or siblings of foreign citizens--particularly those of working age--often experience great difficulty in obtaining exit documents, and can wait for several years before they get exit permission from the authorities.

Several thousand Czechoslovak citizens emigrate annually through complex and expensive official procedures. Applicants must submit 15 different documents to the authorities, pay a heavy, state-assessed reimbursement for education (equivalent to 6 months' average wages) and submit a list of belongings for export approval by Czechoslovak customs. On average, the authorities process emigration applications within 3 months after the acceptance decision is made. Some applications, however, take up to a year to be processed.

From March 1986 through March 1987, the US Embassy in Prague issued 51 immigration visas for family members of American citizens and permanent resident aliens and 8 visas for families of refugees in the United States. This figure is higher than the 41 such visas issued in the same period in 1985-86 but lower than the 68 visas issued in 1984-85 and the over 70 issued in 1983-84. Four US-Czechoslovak family reunification cases currently remain unresolved.[4]

BINATIONAL MARRIAGES

The US Embassy in Prague records around 20 marriages between American and Czechoslovak citizens each year. Czechoslovak authorities require that all of these as well as other binational couples marry in Czechoslovakia.

Normally, spouses of US citizens receive exit permission after a 3- to 6-month processing period. Thus the number of outstanding unresolved cases during each State Department 6-month review period has not exceeded one. However, several incidences of delayed or disapproved applications occurred during the period under review. In a few cases, US citizens' spouses' exit documents have been delayed for no apparent reason. In 1984, Czechoslovak authorities prevented the fiancees of 2 US citizens from marrying and emigrating, while they refused entry visas to the US citizens. In another case, the American fiance of a Czechoslovak woman was refused an entry visa after she had applied for refugee status while on a trip to Vienna and returned to Czechoslovakia when told that her father was dying. And recently, a US citizen of Czechoslovak ancestry was refused an entry visa despite having obtained approval for his marriage prior to his application. Reportedly, these cases have been resolved.

RELIGIOUS CONTACTS

Consistent with its overall approach to religious freedoms, the Czechoslovak regime has limited sharply Czechoslovak citizens' contacts with co-religionists. Official limitation of religious contacts especially has affected the Catholic Church, which is in conflict with the secular authorities over the Vatican ban on *Pacem in Terris* members. In 1985 high-level foreign representatives of the Catholic Church were prevented from entering Czechoslovakia for that country's most important historical Church celebration in many years. Moreover, Czechoslovak state authorities barred the Church from sending a delegation to Austria or Poland during the Pope's 1983 tour. And the state has not permitted Pope John Paul II to visit the country despite urging by the Cardinal and petitions from many thousands of believers.

The Czechoslovak record on exchange of religious materials is mixed. The State Department reports that the Czech Ecumenical Council of Churches imported 1,222,000 Czech Bibles in 1984-85, and in 1985, the Appeal of Conscience Foundation provided 2,000 copies of the Torah to the Czechoslovak Jewish community. Yet any attempt by individuals to facilitate the exchange of materials is punished harshly, as documented in the Czechoslovak Human Rights section of this report.

FAMILY VISITS

Former Czechoslovak citizens who emigrated illegally have trouble securing official permission to visit family in Czechoslovakia; otherwise, foreign citizens face few problems in visiting family in that country. Thousands of Czechoslovak citizens receive permission to visit their relatives in the West annually. Each year during the period covered by this report, the US Embassy in Prague issued about 4,000 visas for family visits.[5] Last year, the number of visas granted by the US Embassy grew by some 20 percent over previous years' numbers.

Where visits to the West are concerned, authorities demand detailed data from applicants, including employment and income information about the people they plan to visit abroad. Male applicants can obtain exit visas only after they have procured approval from the military authorities. The State Bank must confirm its willingness to sell an adequate amount of foreign currency to the applicant or, alternatively, foreign relatives must furnish an invitation guaranteeing that they will pay the expenses incurred by the Czechoslovak citizen during the trip. In 1984, only one in five applicants for travel to the West was given the necessary currency.[6]

The travel application decision extends well beyond the state authorities to include input from the applicant's employers, trade union organization and the "street committee" comprised of the applicant's neighbors keeping an eye on him or her. In a document issued in August 1986, Charter 77 protested the power of employers to affect decisions on allowing citizens to travel abroad. According to this document, the employers' influence is felt at two points in the travel application process. First, the organization must present its point of view on the validity of the request to travel before the request is forwarded to the state bank, which decides whether applicants will be allocated the needed hard currency or not. Then, according to a state decree of 1970, the employer must give his or her consent to the request to travel.[7]

TRAVEL FOR PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL REASONS AND TOURISM

In several instances during the past several years Czechoslovak authorities have refused permission to dissidents seeking to travel abroad. In 1983, for instance, former Foreign Minister and Charter 77 signatory Jiri Hajek was denied an exit permit to participate in a Peace Congress organized by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. A local passport office refused to issue a passport to Father Frantisek Lizna, a priest who has served four prison terms, the last two for working as a priest without a license. The grounds for refusal were that granting him a passport would be contrary to state interests.

One positive development during this reporting period was Martina Navratilova's triumphant return in July 1986 to play tennis in the country from which she defected 11 years ago. While the official Czechoslovak media sought to play down Navratilova's return, authorities did not seek to harass her during her stay in Prague.

The Czechoslovak Government promotes tourism, but at the same time seeks to limit foreigners' contacts with Czechoslovak citizens. Some tourists are discouraged from visiting Czechoslovakia because of the complex currency exchange regulations and procedures. Yet others are intimidated by Czechoslovak authorities when they attempt to meet with Czechoslovak activists. One case in early 1984, the Dutch Secretary-General of the Inter-Church Peace Council and a French citizen were expelled from Czechoslovakia after attempting to contact Charter 77 signatories. Czechoslovak citizens in some professions must file a report with authorities after each conversation they hold with Western visitors.

Limitations on travel to Poland are almost as restrictive as those on trips to th West. Since August 1984, travel for personal business between the two countries effectively has been prohibited. At that time, authorities announced new "principles of tourist traffic" which formalized the limits on travel to Poland which have affected traffic between the two countries since 1982. Because in the past many Czechoslovak refugees have escaped their country by crossing through Yugoslavia, authorities require Czechoslovak citizens travelling there to apply for a gray-colored passport, which is valid only for Yugoslavia.

Travel to Hungary also has become difficult for Czechoslovak citizens. Recently the regime has restricted the amount of currency which may be exchanged and the number of trips which citizens may take each year. In October 1985, Charter 77 sent an open letter to Czechoslovak Prime Minister Strougal, condemning these restrictions, which it attributed to the Czechoslovak regime's nervousness over the effect of Hungary's economic reforms and expanding ties with Austria on the Czechoslovak citizenry. The letter pointed out the hypocrisy of the regime's travel limitations, in light of the Czechoslovak authorities' repeated call for the relaxation of tension in Europe. It read, in part, "Such actions cannot but make relations among nations worse. And it is Hungary that is of interest to our tourists, because of its freer and more pleasant style, which contrasts with the unpleasant atmosphere here."[8]

German Democratic Republic

INTRODUCTION

Many human rights advocates contend that emigration is the most pressing human rights issue in the German Democratic Republic. A majority of East German political prisoners reportedly are serving time either for attempting to leave the country through illegal channels or for filing emigration applications. Recent years have witnessed increasing emigration numbers, but no significant improvement in emigration procedures or a lessening in punitive sanctions for would-be emigrants.

Emigration is a crucial issue not only for interested Westerners and residents of the German Democratic Republic, but for GDR authorities as well. The population of the German Democratic Republic is declining, and the rate of population decline in the German Democratic Republic is roughly equivalent to the number of East German citizens emigrating. For example, in 1985, 24,972 people emigrated from the German Democratic Republic, while the population dropped by 20,000. Of these, 18,752 emigrated legally, 3,384 remained abroad illegally, 2,676 were bought out by the Federal Republic and 160 crossed the border illegally. GDR legal emigration figures have fluctuated unsteadily during the period under review, from 13,208 in 1982, down to 7,729 in 1983, up to a high of 33,066 in 1984, back down to 18,752 in 1985 and 19,982 in 1986.[9] Officials in the West estimate that 300,000-500,000 applications are pending.

The 1984 figure might have been even higher were it not for the showdown between GDR authorities and a group of GDR citizens, eventually including 350 people, who took refuge in the FRG mission in Prague in the hopes of gaining asylum. The regime reacted to the sit-in by reducing sharply the number of exit visas granted. The East Germans left the Embassy in Prague by January 1985 and returned home to the German Democratic Republic, where the authorities reportedly have honored their promise of immunity for the returnee.

Rates of illegal emigration (when GDR citizens leave the country legally for travel, business or other reasons and fail to return) have increased from 2,123 in 1982 to 2,259 in 1983 to 3,864 in 1984 and decreased to 3,384 in 1985. The 1986 figure of 4,660 reflected a significant increase in the illegal emigration rate. The Federal Republic "brought out 1,000 East German political prisoners in 1982, 1,034 in 1983, 2,341 in 1984, 2,676 in 1985 and 1,536 in 1986 in an arrangement which has existed since 1963.[10]

The GDR regime discourages trans-border freedom of movement in general. East Germans are allowed to leave only for purposes of family reunification or because the authorities view them as harmful to society. About 60,000 East Germans who have run into trouble with the authorities for their criminal or political activities must carry special identification cards, which help authorities to restrict their movements inside the country. Some political activists residing outside of East Berlin are not permitted to enter that city.

GDR law provides for heavy sanctions against those citizens who seek to leave the GDR illegally. Article 213 of the GDR Criminal Code calls for 1 to 8 years' imprisonment for such attempts. Article 27 of the March 1982 Law on the GDR State Border calls for border guards to employ firearms to prevent illegal border crossings. If the guards fail to shoot, they may be prosecuted. Over 180 instances in which GDR residents were killed while attempting an escape over the border have been documented. This is only a partial count, as there surely have not been witnesses to every failed escape attempt.[11] The latest documented killing of a would-be East German escapee occurred in November 1986, when GDR guards fired at a man attempting to scale the wall.

The automatic shooting devices and minefields which lined the GDR border with the Federal Republic reportedly have been removed in accordance with President Honecker's October 1983 pledge that the German Democratic Republic would remove all of the devices. However, the border is by no means easier to cross now. The fence along the border has been heightened by 3 meters, a second fence has been erected some 500 meters from the border and over 1,400 watchdogs roam in the border area. Electronic sensors signal every movement in the vicinity of the border to GDR border guards. The effectiveness of the new series of barriers is apparent in the declining numbers of successful illegal border crossings which have occurred during the period in review. In 1982, 269 GDR citizens managed to flee across the border; 228 made it in 1983, 192 in 1984 and only 160 in 1985. In the first 7 months of 1986, 59 East Germans escaped to the West; in July alone, 21 East Germans escaped into West Berlin and the Federal Republic.[12]

Applicants for emigration usually must wait for 1 to 5 years before permission is granted. Some applicants have experienced official sanctions, such as loss of employment and schooling, harassment of and discrimination against their children, and imprisonment. One monitoring agency also has cited instances in which emigration applicants have seen their children forcibly removed from their homes and put up for adoption. Over the reporting period, several Western human rights organizations reported an increase in the number of East Germans convicted for protesting to the authorities regarding emigration application refusals. Their protest letters led to sentences of up to 2 years for "impairment of state or social activities." However, FRG officials reported that the numbers of arrests related to emigration applications dropped from 1,600 in 1985 to about 700 in 1986.[13]

In spite of serious sanctions, citizens demonstrated their desire to emigrate on several occasions during the period under review. In early August 1983, 100 Jena residents demonstrated for the right to relinquish their citizenship and emigrate. Several participants were detained and one was arrested, as was a photographer who tried to record the occasion. In September of the same year, some Gera residents voiced their desire to emigrate by posting signs in their windows to demonstrate their desire to emigrate. Some were arrested, while others were persuaded through more subtle means to remove the signs. In 1984, dozens of East Germans succeeded in emigrating after a protracted sit-in in the West German mission in East Berlin.

ACCESS TO MISSIONS

Beginning in early 1984, GDR authorities began severely to hamper citizens' access to some embassies in East Berlin. Visitors frequently have been intimidated, blocked and arrested when they have attempted entry. Authorities have detained GDR citizens for questioning or have checked their identity papers after departing a Western mission. Many East Germans have been warned to have no contact with Western missions and reportedly some GDR citizens have been required to acknowledge in writing that visiting a foreign mission without permission is a violation of the law for which they will be subject to prosecution. Officials even have advised some who already hold exit visas to request official permission to visit a foreign embassy at least 2 weeks in advance of their appointment at the embassy.

An estimated 400 GDR citizens were arrested after visits to the FRG mission from January through August 1984.[14] Several visitors to other embassies likewise were arrested, including four East Germans arrested after their visit to the US mission in 1984. One of the four was expelled from the German Democratic Republic after 7 months in prison. Members of a family arrested during the period in revew for an unauthorized visit to the FRG Permanent Representation in East Berlin were sentenced to 5 years, 3 years and 8 months, and 15 months in prison, respectively.

In March 1987, West German officials and media protested continuing imprisonment of GDR citizens who have visited the FRG mission in East Berlin or contacted the Federal Ministry for Intra-German Relations in Bonn, or who directly or through representatives have told West German authorities in the Federal Republic or West Berlin of their desire to emigrate. These sentences are sanctioned by paragraph 219 of the GDR Criminal Code, which states, "Anyone establishing contacts with organizations, institutions, groups, or individuals having as their aim activity against the GDR's state order, and knowing of these goals or activities, will receive a prison term of up to 3 years or a suspended sentence."

REUNIFICATION OF FAMILIES

During this reporting period, two significant developments took place which had a direct impact on family reunification cases involving GDR citizens. In September 1983, GDR authorities published for the first time the regulations on family reunification which until that time had been observed in practice but never made public. Thus citizens could learn directly on what grounds emigration applications would be accepted or denied. Publication of these regulations was an important step toward abiding by the letter and spirit of Helsinki where family reunification is concerned.

An October 1983 law redefined the conditions under which East Germans would be permitted to emigrate legally by restricting family reunification cases to first-degree relatives (parents or children) and spouses. At first this created problems for GDR citizens who desired to rejoin their families but who did not conform to the narrow definition of family relationships to which the German Democratic Republic's provisions for family reunification apply. However, recently some applicants with no first-degree relatives in the West have been allowed to emigrate.

Applicants for family reunification face the same sanctions that other would-be emigrants do in the German Democratic Republic: harassment, imprisonment, loss of job, demotion and discrimination in education. In 1985, several GDR citizens whose relatives in West Berlin had demonstrated for the emigration of family members in the German Democratic Republic were arrested on charges of maintaining illegal contacts and provoking slander of the state.

By far the greatest volume of family reunification cases involve the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic. From 1982 through March 1987, 65 bilateral US-GDR family reunification cases requiring Embassy intervention were resolved positively. The US Embassy list presently contains 11 unresolved cases.

BINATIONAL MARRIAGES

Like other East European governments, the GDR regime has set bureaucratic procedures to govern every aspect of international human contacts. While the GDR record on resolving binational marriage cases positively and expeditiously is comparatively good, the fact that state authorities have discretionary powers over GDR citizens' marriage decisions nevertheless places significant restrictions on citizens' personal relationships.

Through 1983 the average waiting time for processing of binational marriage applications was 10 months. However, the GDR regime promulgated a new law in October 1983 to bring binational marriage application procedures closer to the Helsinki provisions. That law specifies that binational marriage applications will be decided within 6 months of filing, and authorities have kept to this time-rame. Permission to marry and emigrate usually is granted within 3 months of the authorities' receipt of the application and supporting documents. Gathering the necessary documents remains a time-consuming process for the applicant.

Before late 1983, applicants were permitted to emigrate to marry a foreigner in the foreigner's home country. The new law of October 1983 changed this policy, constraining applicants first to apply for permission to marry in the German Democratic Republic and only after marriage to apply to emigrate. Despite the new more restrictive policy—which could have the net effect of prolonging the waiting period for emigration in the case of binational marriages—

the US mission has learned of some exceptional cases in which fiances have been allowed to leave the German Democratic Republic before marriage.

Since 1982, only one US-GDR binational marriage case was rejected outright. One other couple had to wait for over 3 years to secure permission from the authorities, but ultimately succeeded. From 1982 through March 1987, 37 of 38 US-GDR binational marriage cases were resolved positively. As of October 1986, the Embassy had 12 unresolved bilateral binational marriage cases on its list.

RELIGIOUS CONTACTS

Contacts between churches in the German Democratic Republic and affiliated churches in other countries are relatively good. The majority Evangelical Church enjoys close ties with its counterpart in the Federal Republic, and receives considerable material assistance from FRG Church bodies. Frequent Evangelical Church-sponsored celebrations during the period in review have included international participation. The United States and the German Democratic Republic have a small exchange program for pastors.

The minority churches also maintain international contacts through visits and the exchange of religious materials. The Jewish community benefits particularly from contact with the Hungarian Jewish community and Jewish communities in the West. The Government has even made arrangements for unofficial churches—such as the Christian Scientists and Jehovah's Witnesses—to receive literature from abroad. Authorities and Christian Science representatives came to such an agreement in December 1984. Jehovah's Witnesses can receive copies of their church publication, "The Watchtower," from abroad.

In 1985, members of the Evangelical Church complained that GDR authorities were hampering contacts at the local level with co-religionists from the Federal Republic, refusing to grant them visas to visit affiliated congregations in the German Democratic Republic. This new trend fits in with the GDR practice throughout the mid-1980's of refusing visas to some independent peace activists from abroad.

FAMILY VISITS

GDR practices concerning family visits affect most acutely those families which are divided between the Federal Republic and the German Democratic Republic. Throughout the period in review, the volume of family visits between these two countries increased steadily.

Prior to 1982, applicants of nonpension age could apply to travel to the West only to visit a close relative in the event of a death or life-threatening illness, a birth, wedding or a 25th, 50th, 60th, 65th or 70th wedding anniversary celebration. Pensioners (age 60 for women and 65 for men) were less restricted in their eligibility to travel to the West. In all cases travelers were required to present documents demonstrating the family relationship and the purpose of travel. Many persons continued to be denied these privileges, even if their family relationship and purpose for travel accorded with the regulations.

In February 1982, the German Democratic Republic pledged in bilateral negotiations with the FRG to grant documentation for family visits, especially birthdays of persons at an advanced age, and for travel in urgent family matters. In particular, non-pensioners could apply to visit close relatives in instances of Confirmation, First Holy Communions, and 60th, 65th, 70th, 75th and any further birthdays. By 1985 trips by GDR citizens to the Federal Republic had increased by 65 percent over the pre-1982 number to 66,000. In 1986, over 200,000 GDR citizens were permitted to visit family in the Federal Republic. Beginning in early 1986, second-degree relatives (aunts, uncles, nieces, nephews) have been included in the categories of family GDR citizens permitted to visit abroad.

GDR travel restrictions have been eased further since the beginning of 1986, facilitating family visits to the Federal Republic. In particular, the German Democratic Republic recently has allowed some spouses to travel together to the West for family visis. However, the laws and regulations setting harsh travel restrictions remain on the books. Regulations restricting contacts with foreigners in the German Democratic Republic remain in force, prohibiting military and police officers, scientists, senior state and Party officials and some other professionals from personal, written or telephone contact with foreign relatives. FRG authorities estimate that some 3 million GDR citizens (of over 15½ million plus East Berlin's 1,200,000 population) are affected by restrictions on contacts.

Ex-citizens of the German Democratic Republic cannot visit their country for 5 years after emigration. Individuals who left the country illegally before January 1, 1981 are eligible to apply for a visitor's visa, but reportedly only half of those who have applied have obtained permission. Those who fled after 1980 face criminal prosecution if they return to the German Democratic Republic.

The US mission in Berlin issued increasing numbers of private visitors' visas throughout the period in review. It issued 1,091 such visas in 1982, 1,184 in 1983, 1,217 in 1984, 1,258 in 1985 and over 1,500 in 1986. The majority of these have been for family visits.

In September 1986, the Embassy issued 34 visas to a group of young East Germans to tour the United States. This represented the first instance since 1974 of GDR citizens visiting the United States in the capacity of tourists rather than to visit family or carryout other business.

TRAVEL FOR PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL REASONS AND TOURISM

The combination of travel-related regulations and shortages of hard currency keep the number of GDR citizens allowed to travel abroad at a minimum. Those who do manage to obtain visas are confined to exchanging only 15 marks a year for travel to the West and 30 marks a day for travel to Warsaw Pact countries.[15] Consequently, they are dependent on family and friends abroad, especially in the West, for financial support.

In July 1984, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic came to an agreement to ease travel restrictions. GDR authorities agreed to reduce the mandatory currency exchange requirements from 25 to 15 marks for most West German pensioners travelling to the German Democratic Republic or East Berlin, to extend the allowable duration of visits to the German Democratic Republic from 30 to 45 days, and to facilitate travel for GDR pensioners to the Federal Republic on occasions besides family visits.

GDR authorities place significant restrictions on travel to neighboring Socialist countries. Only Czechoslovakia is open to every GDR tourist carrying a normal identification card. Travel to Poland in particular is strictly controlled, and travel to other Socialist countries is restricted as well. Currency shortages affect trips to these countries, too. Travellers to Warsaw Pact countries can see young East Germans camping out in train stations and other public places in an effort to conserve their short supply of money.

During the period in review, a significant number of westerners have been denied entry into the German Democratic Republic. For the most part, these have been independent peace activists, but in some cases religious representatives have been denied entry as well. Recent emigres from the German Democratic Republic charge that they are increasingly being prevented from travelling there. The 380 visitors refused entry for the Lepzig Trade Fair were mostly such emigres.

Some westerners who have received visas have been detained after their contacts with GDR citizens went beyond the bounds set by GDR authorities. For example, in October 1984, some members of a Danish peace group were deported to West Berlin after having distributed leaflets and performed a play on disarmament. The following month West German and Dutch peace activists were arrested after participating in a peace demonstration.

GDR restrictions on travel by East Germans abroad and by foreigners to the German Democratic Republic continue significantly to hamper human contacts. However, meaningful improvements have been implemented in intra-German travel which will contribute to closer ties between divided families and friends.

Hungary

INTRODUCTION

In the past few years, Hungary has continued to have a positive record in terms of human contacts and, in fact, has improved its performance in this area. Hungarians generally are permitted to travel abroad for personal and professional reasons, and both family reunification and family visit problems have become increasingly rare. There are no systematic, official sanctions imposed on persons who seek to emigrate, and emigration and travel fees are minimal.

At the same time, this positive Helsinki performance is marred by arbitrary decisions in problem areas, such as permitting members of Hungary's dissident community to travel abroad. Hungarian emigration law continues to be restrictive despite improved performance, making foreign travel and emigration for Hungarian citizens appear to be a benefit subject ultimately to state control.

Beginning in 1984, passport regulations have been streamlined. Applications for passports have been shortened. Instead of the previous eight types of passports, there are now only four types (private, service, diplomatic, and those for Hungarians with dual citizenship who are living abroad). Previously, there were "blue" passports for travel to the West and "red" passports for travel to other Socialist countries. The "red" passports were abolished in 1984, and all passports are "blue." They are now valid for a 5-year period with a possible five-year extension. After this extension, however, a Hungarian citizen must apply for a new passport. Prior to 1982, passports were valid only for 2 years.[16]

An exit permit is still required for any travel abroad. In 1984, however, instead of a large number of different fees, ranging from 20 to 4,000 forints, one uniform fee of 350 forints was established for an exit permit. While this represents a 200 forint increase for travel to Socialist countries, it represents a 250 forint decrease for travel to the West and allows for the crossing of the border several times annually.

Travel of foreigners to and within Hungary generally is not restricted. Tourism has grown considerably in Hungary, and the authorities have taken efforts to encourage it. There have been several developments concerning Hungarian religious and other contacts with other states.

FAMILY REUNIFICATION

Hungarian performance in implementing Helsinki and Madrid commitments in the field of family reunification is good, and that for binational marriages, judging from statistics regarding US-Hungarian cases, is even better.

The fee for emigration was reduced in 1984 from 4,000 to 1,000 forints (from about $100 to just over $20), and an application costs 250 forints (about $5). There are no reported instances of imposed sanctions—such as sudden unemployment or housing difficulties—for applying to emigrate. Upon leaving the country, individuals may take a modest amount of personal property with them.[17]

In many cases, permission to emigrate for the purposes of family reunification is granted at the first application. Persons who are refused permission may appeal and reapply. Such reapplications are sometimes successful, particularly if there are special humanitarian considerations.

Despite their admittedly liberal practices, Hungary's emigration laws remain restrictive, even as compared to those of other East bloc nations. A person normally can apply to emigrate only if joining a parent, spouse or child abroad. However, the law provides for exceptions in individual cases, and the overwhelming majority of Hungarians who are eligible to apply to emigrate for the purpose of family reunification receive permission.

There are several official reasons given for refusing emigration permission:

— Requesting emigration to join a relative remaining abroad illegally for a period less than 5 years (or for whose illegal absence one is responsible);

— Lack of permission from the Ministry of Defense in the case of males of an eligible age for military service who have not partly or completely fulfilled their military obligations;

— Requesting emigration to join a relative not prescribed by law;

— Not having attained the legal minimum age for emigration (55); and

— Being contrary to the public interest.

In practice, the first two of these reasons are usually the ones used to deny emigration requests. Despite the current flexibility in the application of these laws, they may inhibit some Hungarian citizens from applying to emigrate and could give rise to problem cases in the future.

Persons who have emigrated legally from Hungary have the legal right to return upon application. Hungarian citizens who have remained abroad illegally, according to Hungarian laws, are subject to civil penalties for a 5-year period. If such individuals do return to Hungary to reestablish residency, their travel privileges likely will be suspended for 5 years. A particular offender's activities abroad, such as giving interviews to Radio Free Europe or engaging in emigre events, may extend penalties beyond the 5-year period. Because of the considerable flexibility in Hungary's application of its restrictive laws and regulations, some individuals have been able to return as much as 6 months after the expiration of an exit permit without any penalty.

The number of family reunification cases involving the United States has never been high. Since late 1982, when the Hungarian Government resolved all outstanding cases involving the United States, only occasional problems have arisen, and they are generally resolved in a relatively short period of time.

According to the US Department of State, the number of US immigrant visas given to Hungarian citizens in the 1980' is as follows:

US IMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED TO HUNGARIAN CITIZENS

1980	145	1983	101
1981	127	1984	83
1982	109	1985	103

Source: US Department of State.

There have been no binational marriage problems between the United States and Hungary in recent years. Usually, there are more than 50 binational marriage cases handled each year by the US Embassy in Budapest.

FAMILY VISITS

Hungary has implemented a favorable policy regarding family visits. Since 1982, Hungarian citizens enjoy the legal possibility of visiting the West at least once each year for a family visit, instead of every third year as before, as long as financial support is available from friends or relatives for hard currency expenses. The duration of exit permission is dependent on the amount of leave time authorized by the place of employment. Hungarians are permitted to visit relatives in other Socialist states several times a year. Because of the devaluation of the Hungarian forint in 1983, the authorities have permitted a larger number of forints to be converted into hard currency.

Beginning in 1984, trips to Yugoslavia were no longer considered travel to the West. Those with relatives in Yugoslavia could therefore visit them several times each year, provided the hosts cover expenses. Even upon making these visits, they may still apply for exit permission to travel to the West during that same year.

Exit permits for travel to the West are good only for one trip and most frequently are denied in cases of insufficient time since the last visit (less than 1 year), or insufficient proof of support from the relative/sponsor abroad. In addition, permission might be denied if the request is to visit someone who has remained abroad illegally for a period of less than 5 years, although, in cases when this is likely to occur, Hungarians will have someone else issue the invitation. Also, permission may be denied to a person who is responsible for a relative having remained abroad illegally.

Hungarians normally are allowed 30-day stays in European countries and 90-day stays overseas; both of these limits can be extended by the appropriate authorities.

Approximately 4,000-7,000 visas for family visits to the United States are issued annually by the US Embassy in Budapest. Visas rarely are denied to Americans for family visits to Hungary. When they are, however, the Hungarian Foreign Ministry never gives reasons for refusals. It will consider, however, requests for a review, sometimes with a positive result, particularly for cases involving the illness of a close relative.

TRAVEL AND TOURISM

According to official statistics, over 5 million Hungarian citizens travel abroad annually. Of this number, approximately 500,000 travel to Western countries.

Hungarian travel agencies allow certain Hungarian travellers to purchase a wide variety of services, including air tickets, hotel rooms and some tour costs, in forints, thereby reducing to some extent the pressure on the prospective traveller to obtain hard currency. Hungarians are able to obtain hard-currency for a private tourist trip every 3 years.

Generally, a 30-day waiting period is necessary to receive a passport for tourism to the West. Processing for a visit to a Socialist country takes 2 weeks. Exit permits for travel to Western countries are usually valid for only a single trip, while those for travel to other Socialist countries are for multiple trips and valid until the passport expires.

There have been instances when permission to travel abroad have been denied to members of the dissident community in order to induce moderation of their activities. For example, Gyorgy Krasso was refused a passport for 25 years. Not until his brother, who resided in London, was critically injured in a fire, which later proved fatal, was he permitted to travel abroad in November 1985. He has since decided to remain in the West. In 1984, the passport of Gyorgy Kocsi, a young Catholic priest, was withdrawn as punishment for participation in the so-called basic community movement. Gaspar Miklos Tamas was told that if he wanted to travel to the

West, he could obtain permission to do so only on condition that he not return. In addition, noted writer Sandor Csoori was, among other things, denied permission to travel aborad for a full year in 1983, because he wrote an introduction to a book by Miklos Duray, a representative of the Hungarian minority in Czechoslovakia.

There were numerous other dissident intellectuals who were denied permission to travel abroad, and others have been threatened with such a denial. In late 1985 and early 1986, however, the Hungarian Government granted travel documentation to several members of the democratic opposition who had previously been denied, including Gaspar Miklos Tamas. The number of individuals experiencing travel difficulties rose again in late 1986, including democratic opposition members Ferene Koszeg, Janos Kis, and Laszlo Rajk. In early 1987, some of these individuals including Rajk, were then given permission to travel abroad.

Some Hungarian applicants of military age are receiving exit permits for tourist travel to the West which, based on past practices, would have been denied several years ago. Hungarian authorities have published regulations which, for the first time, outline the rights of prospective travellers with military obligations. Normally an applicant in this category may not be denied permission to travel because of pending military obligations, unless service is scheduled to begin within 6 months. The regulations are viewed as a step to increase the predictability and reduce the arbitrariness of the travel system as applied to military-age applicants.

Since mid-1983, more liberal provisions for Hungarians to work abroad for up to 5 years have been in force. These new regulations are consistent with Final Act commitments to increase travel for professional, as well as for personal, reasons. According to Hungarian sources, the number of applications approved annually averages several hundred, mostly for work in the FRG and Austria. Regulations require that the person have a firm job offer or contract before application is made. The worker is required to remit 20 percent of his hard-currency earnings to the Hungarian National Bank, which will convert them into a hard-currency account that may be utilized by the worker within Hungary. The regulations envisage that applicants may take their families with them.

Hungary has offered increasingly good opportunities for foreign tourists. The number of tourists visiting Hungary, most of whom are from other Socialist countries, has exceeded the native population of the country in recent years. In recent years Hungary has built several modern hotels, often with the assistance of Western firms. In addition, privately-run restaurants and boarding houses have helped to alleviate the limited number of rooms available during peak tourist seasons.

As of January 1, 1984, people travelling to Hungary can obtain a visa valid for 3 months; if on business, they can receive a multi-entry visa valid for a full year. Foreigners have to register with the authorities within 48 hours of their arrival in the country instead of 24 hours, as previously required. Hungary has no currency-conversion requirement for visitors, although applicants may have to produce proof of sufficient funds to cover planned stay and departure, particularly when extensions of stay are requested. There are no travel restrictions except for military areas.

Austria and Hungary have a bilateral agreement which obviates the need of a visa for its citizens. Anyone taking part in a package tour to Hungary by Austrian travel agencies can now enter the country without a visa, receiving instead a sightseeing permit. Under these circumstances, the tourist must stay in a state-run hotel and must leave the country within 48 hours. The permit costs 100 forints. For French citizens wishing to visit Hungary and using either a French or Hungarian travel agency, a valid identification card or paper can be used instead of a passport.

In May 1984, the Hungarian authorities liberalized their administrative procedures concerning Hungarians who wish to travel to Israel and for Israelis who wish to visit Hungary. Following the breaking of diplomatic relations in 1967, Hungary allowed its citizens to go to Israel and Israelis to come to Hungary only for the purpose of a family visit. Now, general travel and tourism is permitted.

The estimated number of Americans visiting Hungary in 1985 was 100,000 following steady increases in the past few years. Hungarian Embassies and border authorities usually handle visa applications expeditiously (for the Hungarian Embassy in Washington or the Consulate in New York, usually between 24 and 48 hours), but occasionally refusal of visas to Hungarian-Americans does occur.

RELIGIOUS AND OTHER CONTACTS

Hungary has continued to have a good record in this field. For example, in 1983 the full Hungarian bench of Catholic bishops travelled to Austria to take part in the Pope's visit, which included a ceremony at the grave of Cardinal Mindszenty. The late Cardinal Laszlo Lekai took part in the Pope's visit to Poland that same year. In July 1984, the World Lutheran Federation met in Budapest and elected Hungarian Bishop Zoltan Kaldy its president. Also in 1984, two Hungarian delegations officially representing the Hungarian Jewish community visited Israel. Billy Graham visited Hungary for a third time in September 1985. Many cultural, youth and athletic organizations deal directly with their Hungarian counterparts, and Hungary encourages such exchanges.

POLAND

OVERVIEW OF TRENDS SINCE 1982

Poland's record of compliance with the Final Act's Human Contacts provisions continues to be uneven.

The Polish Peoples Republic (PPR) continues to restrict the citizen's "right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country," as elaborated under Article 13 (2) of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and incorporated by reference to the Declaration in the Helsinki and Madrid documents. The Penal Code still prescribes penalties, including imprisonment up to 5 years, for persons who leave Poland illegally, i.e. without a passport. In Poland, the fundamental right to emigrate is not recognized in law, although significant numbers of Poles manage to do so. Laws and regulations are not applied to all citizens equally and travel permission must be sought and granted anew for each successive journey abroad. Yet, travel between Poland and the West remains extensive.

Approximately 6,000 persons were reported to have emigrated from Poland during the martial law period (December 13, 1981 to July 22, 1983) despite a temporary hiatus on all passport applications during the early part of this period. Additionally, some 125,000 Poles were abroad when martial law was imposed, and did not return.

The new and more liberal Passport Law, which was announced at the end of martial law in July 1983 and enacted in the spring of 1984, has resulted in a comparative easement in passport issuance that continues to the present.

Poland's compliance record in the areas of binational marriage and officially sanctioned sports and youth exchanges continues to be good.

PASSPORT LAWS AND REGULATIONS

Under the new Passport Law, as a welcome departure from past practice, passport offices now must accept all applications for passports and give written reasons for any refusal to issue visas. A notarized letter of invitation to the Polish applicant, verified by a Polish consulate in the United States and valid for 6 months from the date of verification, is still required. Frequently, however, the validity of the invitation expires before the passport has been issued and a second invitation is necessary in many cases. The letter now can be sent from distant relatives and friends, not only from close relatives. Under the new law, the immediate family members and retired parents of persons who have stayed abroad without official permission now may be reunited with their families if the separation has lasted more than 2 years. The 2-year period is extended, however, to 5 years if the person staying abroad has been granted political asylum or is deemed to have engaged in anti-state activities.

The more liberal passport issuance policy for travel does not extend to the most prominent dissidents, many of whom in the past 4 years have been denied permission to go to the West on a temporary basis. Paradoxically, at the same time Poland continues the practice of using emigration as a coercive tool to rid the country permanently of Solidarity leaders and activists by offering them and their families emigration passports not valid for return to Poland.

Regular passports are annotated for: (1) travel to all Socialist countries, which are the easiest to obtain; (2) travel to all countries, which are harder to get and dependent on an approved invitation from a sponsor abroad, but still issued in large volume; and (3) emigration, which are extremely difficult to obtain and good for one exit from Poland. Applicants who are frustrated in their attempts to obtain coveted emigration passports sometimes apply successfully for the more easily obtainable tourist passports. Consequently, under a unique program involving coordination between the Embassy and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the United

States assists those with the right to immigrate to the US by permitting applicants to travel on tourist passports.

The passports for temporary travel must be returned after completion of the trip and a new application submitted for each new journey abroad. Emigration passports are issued most often to spouses of US citizens, retirees, children and "undesirables." Upon departure, emigrants must divest themselves of property, obtain customs permission for any personal items they wish to take and repay the state for the cost of higher education. (Unlike Hungary and Romania, Poland does not fall under the terms of the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment prohibiting the granting of Most-Favored-Nation trading status to any country that levies an "education tax" on emigration because Poland's MFN status was awarded prior to the amendment's enactment. In reaction to the de-legalization of the Solidarity Union in 1982, the United States suspended Poland's Most-Favored-Nation by executive action. Accordingly, Poland's MFN status can be reinstated by executive action independently of the amendment.) Polish consular officials frequently require naturalized US citizens of Polish descent to travel to Poland on Polish consular passports if they are still considered to be Polish citizens under Polish law.

According to the Department of State, the different types of passports and the centralized maze of passport issuance outlets give Polish authorities an arbitrary control over the process that serves their interests in three ways: First, it attempts to ensure that Poles who travel to the United States on tourist passports eventually return to Poland by, *inter alia*, punishing persons who use tourist passports for emigration purposes since entire families rarely are permitted to travel together. Second, the Government applies the law to diminish the outflow of highly trained professionals, whose emigration to the United States represents an economic loss to Poland. Third, the refusal of a passport may be used to punish persons not in favor with the authorities. The latter most clearly affects families of refugees and other exiles who wish to join them in the United States.

Applicants may be refused passports on several counts: if there are pending penal prosecutions; if justified by social considerations (e.g., the need to care for a dependant, a lack of funds to support oneself abroad, etc.); if national security, protection of state secrets, or the national economy could be damaged; or "if the applicant has occasioned damage to the interests of . . . [Poland] by his earlier conduct abroad" or "harmed the good reputation" of Poland within the past 2 years prior to application. Most passport refusals are for those working in scientific or industrial research presumably to prevent "brain drain." The time taken for decisions on passports rarely exceed the 6 months stipulated in the Madrid Concluding Document.

Under Polish citizenship law, only the Council of State may revoke citizenship. According to the law, involuntary revocation must be based on one of the following activities: actions violating the duty of allegiance to the Polish State; actions detrimental to the substantial interests of Poland; departure from Poland after May 9, 1945; failure to return when so requested by the Polish Government; evasion of military service; or conviction abroad of a crime also recognized as a felony under Polish criminal law. The Government used this prerogative in revoking the citizenship of two former Ambassadors, Zdzislaw Rurarz and Romuald Spasowski, who defected to the United States, as well as the citizenship of a Polish journalist, Zdzislaw Najder, the Director of Radio Free Europe's Polish Service. All three were tried *in absentia* and sentenced to death.

FAMILY VISITS AND OTHER TRAVEL FOR PERSONAL OR PROFESSIONAL REASONS AND TOURISM

Travel between Poland and the United States is extensive due to the strong and numerous family ties between US citizens and their relatives in Poland. Last year, there were 40,000-50,000 visitors in both directions. Poland continues to encourage foreign visitors as a source of hard currency. As a rule, foreigners continue to have little or no difficulty obtaining visas into Poland and rarely encounter difficulties with local authorities. One exception occurred in May 1985, when four Americans were detained in Krakow and expelled from Poland on fabricated charges of leading anti-government demonstrations. There are no restrictions placed upon American citizens for travel within Poland.

Travel for personal reasons is possible for the vast majority of Polish citizens, subject to a common restriction of not allowing the entire family to travel together. For Polish citizens, the average duration of Polish Government exit formalities for tourist travel is 2 months. The estimated total cost is the equivalent of $20.

Newspapers abound with stories of Poles who ask for political asylum once they reach the West on tourist passports. Many Poles, with tacit Government approval, live and work for extended periods of time in the West. They send and bring back to Poland badly needed hard currency. They rarely have difficulty returning to Poland. Since Polish travellers must relinquish their passports in exchange for internal security documents shortly after returning from any trip and must reapply for issuance of a passport before leaving Poland on a subsequent trip, Polish authorities always can exercise their power under the passport law to refuse a new exit on the basis of "misuse" of a previous passport. "Misuse" can include remaining outside Poland for an extended period of time on a passport acquired for a short tourist journey. In such case, the Polish Government regards as immaterial the receiving country's point of view on the legality of the stay.

The number of non-immigrant visas issued by the US Embassy in Warsaw and constituent posts in Poznan and Krakow, indicates that travel for family visits has been increasing substantially since 1982:

NON-IMMIGRANT (NIV) AND TOURIST (B-2) VISA ISSUANCE

	NIV's	B-2's
April 1, 1986 to September 30, 1986	32,500	28,000
October 1, 1985 to April 1, 1986	24,342	21,630
April 1, 1985 to October 1, 1986	28,365	24,917
October 1, 1984 to April 1, 1985	20,095	18,039
April 1, 1984 to October 1, 1984	11,669	9,108

NON-IMMIGRANT (NIV) AND TOURIST (B-2) VISA ISSUANCE—Continued

	NIV's	B-2's
December 1, 1983 to March 31, 1984	5,488	4,177
June 1, 1983 to November 30, 1983	4,394	* N/A
December 1, 1982 to May 31, 1983	2,234	* N/A

* Not available

There is a long tradition of academic and scientific exchange with the United States; Poland sends nearly the same number of exchange visitors to the United States as it does to the rest of the Warsaw Pact combined. The right to participate in such exchanges is not limited to Party members, as in some other countries. However, due to a fear on the part of the Government of "brain drain," it is increasingly difficult for Polish scientists and academics to accept invitations for long-term (more than 6 months) exchange visits.

A number of prominent Polish dissidents, who also are specialists in academic and scientific fields, have encountered difficulties in obtaining passports to travel abroad for professional reasons. For example, Marek Nowakowski, a prominent writer and Solidarity sympathizer, who had been imprisoned in 1983-84, has been refused a passport repeatedly to accept invitations by private individuals and institutions in the West, including the French PEN Club. Grzegorz Boguta, a biochemist and expert on proteins, who was interned for 1 year in 1982 for his involvement with Solidarity and independent publishing, has been refused exit permission since 1984, when he applied for a passport in order to accept a 2 year fellowship at Temple University's Thrombosis Research Center in Philadelphia, PA.

FAMILY REUNIFICATION

The principle of family reunification is acknowledged by the Polish Government as a legitimate reason for emigrating. The number of family reunfication cases and the rate of their resolution has not varied significantly since the conclusion of the Madrid Meeting. The number of unresolved divided family cases for Poland involving the United States and other Western states remains numerically the highest among the Warsaw Pact states. This is in part a reflection of the large ethnic Polish populations in Western countries, particularly the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. But it is also an indication that Poland's record of compliance has consistently fallen short of Final Act and Madrid Concluding Document commitments. Reportedly, however, there are proportionately fewer denials of passport applications for family reunification purposes in Poland than is true in other East Europeanstates with the exception of Hungary. And, since the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, Poland has permitted more people to emigrate to the United States for this purpose than prior to its adoption. Consequently, the US Embassy in Warsaw processes more immigrant visas than any other US Embassies in Eastern Europe.

The number of cases on the divided family list which the US Embassy presents to the Polish Government remains high, however, the State Department reports that resolutions of family reunification cases since April 1986 have been the result of the relaxation of Polish Government policy on passport issuance rather than any consistent effort by Polish authorities to reunite families in compliance with Final Act commitments.

DIVIDED FAMILY CASES

	Nuclear Families		Non-Nuclear Families	
	Cases	Individuals	Cases	Individuals
Apr. 1, 1986 to Oct. 1, 1986	57	117	189	573
Oct. 1, 1985 to Apr. 1, 1986	179	368	170	871
Apr. 1, 1985 to Oct. 1, 1985	198	401	160	851
Oct. 1, 1984 to Apr. 1, 1985	187	384	269	871
Apr. 1, 1984 to Oct. 1, 1984	145	261	249	859
Dec. 1, 1983 to Mar. 31, 1984	145	295	249	791
June 1, 1983 to Nov. 30, 1983	160	332	232	734
Dec. 1, 1982 to May 31, 1983	123	238	189	630

While resolution of these cases proceeds more rapidly than in other East European countries, the Embassy reports a steady stream of immigrant visa cases in which delays in passport issuance cause lengthy family separation. Entire families rarely receive passports at the same time. This is particularly true in the case of professionals. Generally, the spouse who receives a passport receives only a tourist passport, not valid for emigration. Thus, the spouse receiving the passport remains tied to Poland by the spouse forced to remain and, because passport issuance always requires a favorable government decision, there is no guarantee when—or if—the remainder of the family will be allowed to leave Poland.

The German Red Cross reports that approximately 125,000 Polish citizens of German extraction officially have registered to leave Poland. Emigration—both legal and illegal—from Poland to the Federal Republic of Germany remains substantial, but, as is the case with the United States, large numbers of cases remain unresolved. Thousands of Poles travel to the FRG relatively freely every year and many overstay their visas or seek political asylum. Others work to earn hard currency and return to Poland. As of September 1986, the FRG Government reports that there are approximately 100,000 Polish refugees living in West Germany who have not yet been granted asylum.

EMIGRATION FROM POLAND TO THE FRG

Year	Emigrants
1982	30,355
1983	19,121
1984	17,455
1985	20,075
Total for 1986	27,188

BINATIONAL MARRIAGES

Permission of a Polish court must be sought to marry in Poland, with court proceedings averaging about 4 months to complete. Complications arise from the fact that the US Government does not issue documents stating that an American citizen is free to marry, so the US citizen must convince the Polish court that he or she is unmarried. Reportedly, a treaty addressing legal services, which could reduce or even eliminate these difficulties, currently is under consideration. Also, as the Polish Government does not recognize US divorces involving Polish nationals, divorce proceedings must be repeated in the Polish courts, an exercise that generally takes 6 months.

Once a binational marriage has taken place, exit permission for the Polish spouse rarely presents a problem. The US Embassy in Warsaw reports no recent case of the processing of an exit permit taking more than the six months stipulated in the Madrid Concluding Document.

Binational Marriages

October 1, 1985 to May 1, 1986	3
April 1, 1985 to October 1, 1985	0
October 1, 1984 to April 1, 1985	5
April 1, 1984 to October 1, 1984	3
December 1, 1983 to March 31, 1984	4
June 1, 1983 to November 30, 1983	5
December 1, 1982 to May 31, 1983	0

RELIGIOUS CONTACTS

Poland permits frequent religious contacts. The US Embassy in Warsaw currently issues nonimmigrant visas to members of the Polish clergy at the rate of approximately four per week. Most Polish clergy seem to have no difficulty in obtaining passports for travel abroad. Frequently, they are able to do this on significantly shorter notice than other travelers. Representatives of various US religious denominations have also been able to travel to Poland without government interference.

The most notable trip of a religious leader to Poland was the successful return visit of Pope John Paul II in June 1983, when an estimated one-third of the Polish population came out to greet him.

TRADE UNION CONTACTS

In Poland, the ability of US visitors to visit sites and meet trade unionists of their choosing who are engaged in workers rights advocacy is circumscribed. Making known the intention or desire to meet with Solidarnosc representatives has been sufficient to lead to visa denial. At the time Solidarnosc was still legal in Poland, it invited AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland to attend its founding Congress. The Polish Government refused him a visa. For example, in 1984, United Auto Workers International representative John Christenson was told by the Polish Embassy in Washington that he would not be granted a visa to visit Poland if his visit would include any meetings with Solidarnosc members. A further condition, he was told, would be that upon arrival he must publicly acknowledge the official trade union (OPZZ) as the sole legitimate workers' organization. In view of these conditions, he did not proceed with a formal application for a visa.

In December 1986, the Polish Government denied visas to an AFL-CIO delegation, headed by President Lane Kirkland, which had planned to meet with Lech Walesa. The Polish authorities made it clear that visas would be issued only on the condition that the delegation agree to meet with representatives of the official state-sponsored unions established by Jaruzelski's government after Solidarnosc have been declared illegal. The AFL-CIO refused to comply with this condition.

By the same token, attempts of US unions to invite Polish trade unionists of their choosing to visit the United States has been totally blocked. The requirement of exit visas for Polish nationals prevents the right of free, self-determined labor contacts from being exercised. In 1981 and again in 1983, Lech Walesa was invited to the AFL-CIO Conventions. He withdrew his applications for exit visas when the Polish Government refused to assure him he would be allowed to return to Poland. On October 23, 1986, Walesa was refused a passport to receive a humanitarian award from the John-Roger Foundation of Santa Monica, CA. Walesa's aide, Wladyslaw Trzcinski, said the Gdansk Interior Ministry office told him the union leader had not completed the passport application correctly. Walesa had applied for a passport earlier in the year for an aborted journey to Italy and thought that he did not need to reapply for the US trip.

ACCESS TO MISSIONS

On April 27, 1983, the Polish Government demanded that the US Embassy library end all "external services" for Poles, including film showings and the lending of books. On May 2, the Polish police began interdicting visitors to the Embassy. Until the end of March 1984, Polish militia and guards periodically prevented Polish film-goers and library visitors from entering the US Embassy, consulate premises and press and culture offices or subjected them to intimidating document checks and questioning. Polish academics and intellectuals were warned by the Polish authorities that social contacts with US Embassy personnel were to be avoided. However, by 1986 conditions had eased considerably, and document checks have been discontinued, although Polish militia continue closely to monitor access to the US Embassy and consulates.

MAIL DELIVERY AND TELEPHONE COMMUNICATION

According to the US Department of State, the Polish Government has a mixed record on mail delivery. For example, 3,000 social security checks sent from the Embassy monthly usually arrive promptly, though other domestic mail to and from the Embassy and consulates is often received late or not at all. International mail is even more problematic. Invitations to scientific and academic exchanges sent by US institutions often reach the Polish invitee only after several months' delay. Some scientists report unwelcome attention from the security forces in the wake of receiving letters from US universities and other scientific institutions. Letters from abroad are often received with a stamp saying that they came in "damaged" form, and show evidence of resealing. Potential visitors and immigrants also commonly report difficulties in receiving documents (e.g., the invitations needed in passport applications and affidavits of support) sent from the United States. Many try to arrange to have such papers brought back to Poland by hand, as they simply do not trust the Polish mails.

Similarly, most Poles assume that international calls are subject to eavesdropping. An unheralded agreement allowing direct-dial telephone communications from the United States to Poland took effect on October 2, 1983. Poles cannot, however, direct dial to the United States.

CONCLUSION

In the field of human contacts, as in other areas of Helsinki Final Act implementation, Poland presents a mixed and fluid picture. With the exception of a hiatus in the immediate post-martial law period, the overall flow of people between Poland and the West has remained extensive in both directions. Nonetheless, the Polish Government imposes artificial restrictions on the freedom of contacts and movement—and particularly on the emigration—of its citizens in contravention of the Final Act and Madrid Concluding Document.

ROMANIA

INTRODUCTION

The Romanian regime does not recognize freedom of movement as a fundamental right; rather, it considers it a privilege which should be afforded only to a small number of individuals exceptional either for their loyalty or their "undesirability." In the first instance, Romanian citizens with unblemished records of support for the regime may travel abroad, usually without at least one member of their family; in the second, those who dissent from the regime's stand on political or religious questions may be exiled.

The Romanian authorities place bureaucratic barriers in the way of citizens desiring to leave Romania, either for a temporary foreign visit or for permanent emigration. However, despite the regime's disapproval, significant numbers of Romanian citizens grudgingly are permitted to emigrate to the United States, Israel and the Federal Republic of Germany each year.

Many Romanians, despairing of ever procuring a passport and exit visa, attempt to emigrate from Romania illegally. Increasing numbers of Romanian tourists seek political asylum in the West. Others try to slip across the border. Article 245 of the Criminal Code, "Fraudulent Crossing of National Boundaries," establishes a sentence of 6 months' to 3 years' imprisonment for those who try to leave the country illegally.

In November 1982, the Romanian Council of State issued Decree 402, which set an exit fee to compensate the state for the higher education would-be emigrants had received in Romania. Between February and June 1983, Romania required that all emigrants repay the state in convertible currency the cost of any education they had received beyond the compulsory ten years of schooling. In

March 1983, President Reagan declared that Romania would lose its Most Favored Nation status as of June unless application of the "education tax" were ended. After strong international protest and following bilateral negotiations between the Romanian Government and the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel, respectively, Romania ceased to apply the "education tax," but has left it on the books.

While the "education tax" is no longer being applied, economic and procedural barriers to emigration persist. Before leaving the country, many successful emigrants have had to overcome countless bureaucratic obstacles and endure months, and sometimes years, of harassment and intimidation by authorities, including job demotion or dismissal, eviction from apartments, expulsion from schools or universities, and confiscation of identification and ration cards.

Romanian authorities continue to impede access to the American Embassy in Bucharest. Guards demand that Romanian visitors present a Romanian passport entitling them either to travel abroad or to emigrate. Visitors to the American library still enjoy unimpeded access. However, recently promulgated but unpublished decrees on contacts with foreigners most likely will have an adverse effect on access to this institution.

REUNIFICATION OF FAMILIES

Romania has the highest number of unresolved family reunification cases—involving Romanians with family in the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel—of all the countries of Eastern Europe. Successful emigration applicants wait, on average, 8 to 12 months, a period considerably longer than the 6 months called for in the Madrid Concluding Document. Some applicants wait 2 years or more for resolution of their cases. The International League for Human Rights lists twelve people who have waited for over 20 years to emigrate.[18]

The application process consists of two stages, first filling out a short-form and then a long-form application. Artificially protracting the application process, the Romanian authorities reject many short-form applicants and discourage them from further pursuing emigration. It is impossible to estimate accurately the number of people receiving either short or long forms each year. The American Embassy in Bucharest notes that in general, the average successful family reunification case takes 1 to 1½ years to resolve.

Receiving approval from the Romanian Government is not the end of the struggle for would-be emigrants. In general, emigration applicants are required to sell all their personal property at state-set rates. They are not allowed to take currency out of the country. And often they are fired from their job or demoted well before they have permission to leave or a place to go.

Decree 153/1970 establishes that working-age Romanians who do not hold a job can be charged with "parasitical" or "anarchic" conduct. It carries a sentence of 6 months' imprisonment or "corrective labor without deprivation of liberty" (an assigned menial job, at very low wages). If one is sentenced to corrective labor, he or she may not leave the area without official permission.

Since late 1985 the Commission has received relatively fewer reports of harassment of emigration applicants who await entry into the United States. In July 1985, American and Romanian representatives worked out an agreement whereby Romanians who had applied for emigration to the United States to be guaranteed equal access to basic necessities and social services as other Romanian citizens. But the Romanian authorities still will not restore basic civil rights—such as the right to education—to those who applied for American visas before 1985 and are still waiting.

Other forms of harassment, however, continue unabated. Children whose families have applied to emigrate face discrimination in school. Some families have reported that their children have been prohibited by authorities from enrollment in school.[19]

The financial cost of emigration is also high. Romanian exit documents are expensive. Romanians must pay additional sums to extend their visas until entry is granted into the country of their destination, and they must pay for renunciation of their Romanian citizenship (which is required for emigrants).

Despite the high financial and personal cost to applicants and the significant discouraging barriers, many thousands of Romanian citizens emigrate each year. The 1982-86 legal emigration figures for the United States, Israel and the Federal Republic of Germany are listed below:

YEAR	USA	ISRAEL	FRG
1982	2,381	1,474	11,546
1983	3,499	1,331	13,957
1984	4,545	1,908	14,831
1985	2,913	1,327	13,072
1986	1,996	1,281	13,130

These figures include Romanians who left as refugees, as well as those who emigrated on the grounds of family reunification. The number of those who crossed the Romanian border surreptitiously or remained abroad illegally is not known.

BINATIONAL MARRIAGES

As in the area of family reunification, Romania discourages binational marriages and prolongs the processing time of most cases, often to 1 or 2 years. In addition to the paperwork and waiting time involved in binational marriage applications, marriage applicants must obtain the blessing of the Romanian Parliament before final approval is granted. At least five current US-Romanian binational marriage cases have remained unresolved for over 2 years, and as of April 1986, 25 of the 43 cases on the American Embassy's list have been outstanding for longer than the 6 months mandated in the Madrid Concluding Document. However, most cases ultimately are resolved positively.[20]

RELIGIOUS CONTACTS

As with Romanian performance in other areas of religious rights, official policy varies widely depending on the status and favor each denomination enjoys in Romania. Leaders of officially recognized churches often are permitted to go abroad to meet with co-religionists. Leaders of other, nonrecognized churches or those who follow an activist line unpopular with the authorities are not allowed to go abroad or, alternatively, are refused reentry after they have travelled abroad.

The Romanian record on visits by Western church members to Romania likewise is mixed. In September 1985, American evangelist Billy Graham was allowed to tour Romania, preach to large gatherings and meet with leaders of various denominations. However, there have been many instances in the past several years of Western churchpeople being denied access to Romania. Also, the Romanian authorities bar much information exchange which constitutes an important part of religious contacts. One especially difficult new restriction on religious contacts in Romania is the recent, unpublished decree which prohibits foreign visitors from preaching without prior official permission.

The Romanian Baptist Church is a member of the Baptist World Alliance and the European Baptist Federation. The leader of the Romanian Baptist Union became vice-president of the latter organization in 1985 and will become president in 1987. The Evangelical (Lutheran) Church has close ties with churches in the Federal Republic of Germany. Armenians in Romania likewise have close ties with the Armenian Church in the Soviet Union. The Romanian Jewish community is a member of the World Jewish Congress and enjoys contacts with Jewish communities in the United States, Israel and elsewhere.

FAMILY VISITS

Romania keeps the door open to Romanians' foreign relatives who wish to visit their families in Romania. Such visitors rarely run into difficulties in obtaining visas, and enjoy preferential treatment in comparison with the restrictions placed on other tourists. For example, first-degree family members are allowed to stay with their Romanian relatives (not just at the Government facilities to which other tourists are confined) and are not required to keep to the minimum daily purchase of the equivalent of $10 in Romanian lei.

Romanian citizens also encounter barriers when seeking to apply for passports and exit visas. Only in exceptional circumstances are entire families granted passports for foreign visits; usually one or several family members are left at home to ensure that the travelers will return to Romania. The families of defectors are subject to tremendous pressure to disassociate themselves from their relatives remaining abroad illegally. Defectors' families can have little hope of a speedy departure from Romania; if they are allowed to leave at all, generally they must wait several years and endure repeated rejections of their emigration applications.

Several families have been so affected during the reporting period. In 1982, New York-based Romanian Trade Commissioner, Napoleon Fodor elected to stay in the United States. His wife's and son's efforts to rejoin him in the United States has been rejected time and again by the Romanian authorities. The Fodors are entering their fifth year of separation.

In 1985, Rodica Ruta, a Romanian employee of Control Data, decided to remain in the United States. Her husband, Ioan Constantin Ruta, and daughter Alina applied to emigrate to the United States to rejoin Rodica. Soon thereafter, Ioan Constantin was arrested on trumped-up corruption charges. He was sentenced in November 1986 to 7 years in prison and a large fine. During his detention and imprisonment, he has suffered at least two heart attacks and a stroke. The Rutas' daughter Alina was allowed to join her mother in January 1987; Ioan Constantin remains in prison.

The American Embassy in Bucharest issues upward of 3,000-4,000 tourist visas each year, most of which are for family visits in the United States.[21]

TRAVEL FOR PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL REASONS

Professional travel is carefully monitored and usually discouraged by the Romanian authorities. Radio Free Europe reports that cultural, scientific and scholarly contacts between Romanians and other nationals have been curtailed increasingly over the last decade, and the State Department confirms that during the past 6 months alone Romanian practices have made permission for professional travel abroad more difficult to obtain. Among those who do go abroad, more and more are opting to stay abroad permanently.

Article 12 of the Romanian Decree on Passports gives Romanian authorities wide discretion in granting or refusing to grant passports. It allows them to refuse to issue documents when, in their estimation, "by going abroad, a Romanian citizen could prejudice the interests of the Romanian state or affect the good relationship thereof with other states."

Other, bureaucratic mechanisms assure the authorities tight control over citizens' private travel above and beyond officials' discretion in granting exit documentation. Personal travel is permitted only once every 2 years in most circumstances. Limited aailability of foreign currency also limits Romanians' foreign travel.

Two cases concerning prominent Romanian mathematicians denied permission to take up academic posts at American universities attracted considerable attention from the international scientific community in 1985 and 1986. Mathematicians Radu Rosu and Silviu Teleman finally obtained their exit visas in summer, 1986, in the midst of the annual Most-Favored-Nation status review. Also, during the period under review, two former Romanian ambassadors to the United States were denied official permission to travel to New York to deliver lectures. Fewer Romanians have been allowed to travel abroad through cultural exchange programs. American participants in exchanges with Romania often complain that the Romanian authorities substitute individuals other than the ones invited.

TOURISM

While Romania promotes domestic tourism actively, the authorities prefer and seek to ensure that visitors see the sights and not meet Romanian citizens. Recently the Romanian authorities promulgated, but did not publish, a series of decrees concerning Romanian contacts with foreigners. Romanian citizens are required to report on any meeting with a foreigner within 24 hours of the meeting or risk detention, long interrogations and possible imprisonment. Another, unpublished decree significantly limits opportunities for foreign commercial representatives to visit enterprises.

Romanian authorities seem especially wary of cross-border minority contacts. In November 1983, Romanian border guards closed the Romanian-Hungarian border for several hours on a 3-day weekend in a deliberate attempt to impede family and friends from visiting Romanians. In October 1984, an ethnic Hungarian United Nations official travelled to Romania and visited several Transylvanian Hungarians. After his visit the *Securitate* interrogated him as well as all the people with whom he had met. On a few occasions in 1985, as well several Hungarian tourists were not allowed to enter Romania. And in 1986, 2 US citizens travelling on tourist visas were expelled from Romania for their attempts to contact some well-known ethnic Hungarians.

Bibles, Hungarian-language publications and other printed matter which customs officials judge provocative are routinely confiscated at the border. Publications sent by mail from Hungary to Transylvanian Hungarians are confiscated frequently. The exchange of periodicals between Romanian and Hungarian institutions has likewise been cut. Harassment of non-Romanians at the border, as well as interference with exchange of publications and other materials, significantly impinges not only upon tourism, but upon family, religious and minority contacts as well.

SOVIET UNION

INTRODUCTION

Soviet compliance with the human contacts provisions of the Final Act remains poor. Soviet performance in the fields of emigration, family reunification, family visits and travel has deteriorated since the issuance of the Commission's 1982 implementation report, despite the additional obligations undertaken at Madrid.

The number of people permitted to emigrate has diminished sharply, reaching its lowest levels since the signing of the Final Act. The rates of emigration for Jews, Germans and Armenians, the only groups which were permitted to emigrate, continued to drop. In 1985, emigration of Jews and Germans reached their lowest point since 1970. In 1985, only 1,140 Jews, 406 Germans and 109 Armenians were permitted to emigrate. The pattern continued in 1986. Only 914 Soviet Jews were permitted to emigrate in 1986. Emigration of other Soviet citizens remains virtually non-existent. There are some indications that levels may be rising. In March 1987, over 400 Soviet Jews received permission to emigrate, the highest monthly figure since the end of 1981.

Family reunification is the only basis the Soviets recognize for emigration and the definition of family, although not uniform, has become increasingly narrow. Applying for emigration permission continues to be a difficult, cumbersome and arbitrary process fraught with immense hardships for the intending emigrant. Harsh and often brutal treatment of would be emigrants continues.

The low level of emigration throughout most of the reporting period, the difficulty in obtaining emigration or travel permission and the unpredictibility and arbitrariness of the process must be viewed within the context of a system which seeks to minimize human contacts.

FAMILY REUNIFICATION AND EMIGRATION

Laws and Regulations

Neither the Soviet Constitution nor any pertinent published laws contain provisions granting the Soviet citizen the undeniable right to leave his country. Despite the Soviet Government's commitments under international agreements which recognize the right to leave one's country, emigration is regarded as a privilege and not as a right.

The only recognized legal basis for emigration from the USSR is family reunification. In practice, only Jews, ethnic Germans and Armenians have been permitted to emigrate from the Soviet Union in significant numbers. For members of other nationalities in the USSR, such as Russians, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians, emigration is virtually non-existent.

Emigration from the USSR is directed and monitored by the Ministry of the Interior. Some basic information on emigration is contained in the 1970 Statute on Entry into and Exit from the USSR, until recently the only published Soviet statute on emigration. In November 1986, at the Vienna CSCE Follow-up Meeting, the Soviets announced a new law regulating applications for entry into or exit from the USSR by Soviet citizens and foreigners. The law went into effect on January 1, 1987. Despite a few procedural changes, the law generally seems to be a codification of existing practices, including the retention of a definition of family so narrow as to exclude many who would like to emigrate.

The pattern begun in 1980, when Soviet authorities issued regulations which further narrowed definitions of family for purposes of emigration, has continued. Under these rules, only people with first-degree relatives are eligible to apply for emigration. Since the Commission's 1982 implementation report, emigration authorities have been defining family reunification in even narrower terms. Only those with a spouse, parents, or children abroad have any prospects of being allowed to emigrate. Under the new emigration law, those with brothers and sisters may now have a chance to emigrate.

Procedures and Practices

The emigration process remains arbitrary, burdensome, costly and time consuming. The procedures are fraught with red tape and are clearly designed to serve as a deterrent to the prospective emigrant. A would-be emigrant is required to submit numerous detailed documents to the Office of Visas and Registration (OVIR) of the Ministry of Interior, which administers emigration and travel policy.

The first of these documents is an invitation from a relative abroad (vyzov), an affidavit stating that the applicant has relatives living abroad. Until May 1979, the vyzov could come from any relative. Since then, the Soviets have required that it come from first-degree relatives. Although many Soviet Jews have immediate family living in the United States, only invitations from Israel are nominally acceptable to OVIR. The vyzov may not be extended by the embassy of the country from which it came, and often is accepted only if received via international mail. Since 1983 there have been increasing reports that some persons have been told that their vysovs would now be accepted for only one application. According to a recent document by Soviet refuseniks: "In the past this document (vyzov) was considered valid for a year and its validity could be extended at the Dutch Embassy. Later invitations, the validity of which had been extended, were not accepted for consideration and now an invitation is considered valid for a period of 6 months from the date on which it was drawn up in Israel."[22]

According to the FRG-based International Society for Human Rights, "the shortening of the period of a vyzov's validity from 12 to 6 months has in many cases led to the applicant being unable to collect the required certificates within the allowed period of time." Also, since, at least in practice, there is no uniform definition of close family, applications based on vyzovs from a certain kind of relative in one area of the country will be rejected in another. However, "the number of complaints about nonacceptance by the OVIR of applications on the grounds of insufficienctly close kinship is growing."[23] In many cities, OVIR offices refuse to accept application documents if proof of direct kinship between the applicant and the person who sent the invitation is not available. Nondelivery of vyzovs remains a problem, although, according to reports from the USSR, there have been recent improvements in their delivery by Soviet postal authorities.

Other documents necessary for submission of an application include a declaration of the applicant's wish to emigrate; a character reference from his or her place of employment; permission from the applicant's parents regardless of the applicant's age; permission from a former spouse when children from that marriage are involved; a certificate testifying to possession of a legitimate residence permit; a birth certificate and diplomas. The Leningrad OVIR requires applicants to indicate the names of all relations as well as former places of work. The forms have to be certified at the applicant's last place of work. Also, OVIR offices require a document certifying that the applicant's parents intend to remain in the USSR or his former spouse have no material claims on him.

The lengthy, cumbersome documents are intended to frustrate and obstruct. For example, regarding the document to secure parental or spousal permission: "Since Soviet law recognizes no instance where a competent adult requires the signature of spouse or parents to act in such matters, notaries refuse to attest to these signatures on travel affidavits, thus often creating yet another complication for the would-be emigrant."[24] Furthermore, this document often "becomes an object of blackmail and extortion by, for example, a father who has never seen his child or a former wife who demands that she be paid for such a document a sum of money several times larger than the total sum of alimony payments due to her until the child becomes of age."[25]

After submitting required documents to the OVIR, there has been no set time for application review. However, under the new regulations which went into effect January 1, 1987, decisions on applications are to be made within a month, unless "further consideration was necessary," when the period could be extended to 6 months. If it takes more than 6 months the vyzov will be invalid. Additional bureaucratic impediments such as limited OVIR hours, refusals to provide application forms and open hostility continue to be common. In some cases, emigration officials refuse to accept applications to join family members. In these cases, a spouse left the Soviet Union with temporary exit permission and applied for refugee status in the United States. In other cases, the relative in the US had obtained exit permission from Israel, but had gone to the United States. Furthermore, according to the US Department of State "The Soviet authorities in Yerevan, the capital of the Armenian Republic, have recently begun asking roughly two thirds of the individuals to whom they grant exit permission to sign pledges that once they are abroad they will not forward invitations for permanent residence to relatives in the USSR."[26]

It is not uncommon for emigration authorities merely to ignore emigration requests. Answers simply never come. Increasingly, others, upon refusal, are being told to "reapply next year" despite the fact that the Madrid Concluding Document calls upon the participating States to decide family reunification applications within 6 months. According to the US State Department, "Many persons have withheld application, reasoning that the authorities are giving them an indication of when they will be granted exit permission."[27] Also, more long-term refuseniks—those who repeatedly have been refused permission to emigrate—have been told that their applications will not be accepted and that their cases will never be resolved. This is in clear violation of the Madrid Concluding Document pledge to inform applicants for emigration as "expeditiously as possible of the decision" on their cases, and, in cases of refusal, to inform them of "their right to renew applications after reasonably short intervals."

"Insufficient closeness of kin," one of the most frequent official reasons for refusal has become more restrictive and its application more consistent. A chameleon definition of family has been arbitrarily applied by the OVIRs in various parts of the Soviet Union. For the most part, only immediate family members have had any prospects of emigrating. Since the last reporting period well over half of all US-Soviet emigration cases involved spouses of US citizens.

In 1983, the Soviets initiated the "balance of family ties" refusal. Soviet authorities often count a would-be emigrant's relatives in the USSR, including in-laws and distant relatives, and compare them against the number residing abroad. If the prospective emigrant has more relatives in the Soviet Union than in the US, his or her emigration is regarded as exacerbating, rather than resolving, a divided family case. Hence, in some cases, the Soviet Government has refused to permit emigration of those who have more relatives in the Soviet Union than abroad, on the grounds that the case "does not correspond with family reunification." In the case of Petras Pakenas, whose wife Galina Vileshina is a US citizen, Soviet authorities claimed that his case could not be considered under the category of family reunification because the majority of his close relatives lived in the USSR. Sometimes even when there are more relatives abroad, the person can be refused exit permission because his family ties are deemed "stronger" in the USSR.

Another frequent and arbitrary reason for refusals of exit visas is that the applicant had access to "state secrets." In some cases, emigration applicants were never even aware that they may have been doing classified work. According to the London Institute of Jewish Affairs, the secrecy clause has been applied "to people who have worked in industrial and scientific establishments in non-classified research, or who have already published their findings, as well as to people who have served in the Soviet armed forces in whatever capacity."[28] Often, a person who served as a regular soldier years ago will be denied emigration permission because he allegedly possessed state secrets. The new January 1987 Soviet emigration regulations do not permit personal travel for those who have knowledge of state secrets—"until expiration of the circumstances preventing departure." On February 12, 1987, the Soviet newspaper *Vechernaya Moskva* carried an official statement by the Moscow OVIR which identified eight Jews who are not permitted to emigrate because they were once employed in classified government work. The list includes prominent refusenik Vladimir Slepak who first applied to emigrate in 1969.

The Soviet Government arbitrarily applies the length of the declassification period. Despite Secretary General Gorbachev's public assertion at a Paris press conference on October 2, 1985, that the "security" period comes to an end after at most 10 years, over 100 refusenik cases rejected on security grounds exceed the 10 year period. These cases include that of Professor Alexander Lerner, an internationally known cybernetician, who was dismissed from his position as a director of an institute after applying to emigrate to Israel in 1971, and Naum Meiman, a mathematician and member of the Moscow Helsinki group who applied in 1974 to emigrate to Israel but was refused on security grounds based on work he performed in the early 1950's—over 30 years ago.

Other applicants have been refused because someone deemed that it was "inexpedient at this time" or that "the international situation does not warrant your emigration." Other reasons have ranged from "you must stay behind to take care of your wife's parents" to "you are financially secure and have no reason to leave the Soviet Union."

Denials are never given in writing. It is impossible to appeal against a refusal through the courts or through administrative procedures. "All complaints about the actions of OVIR officials are automatically sent to the very OVIR office about which the complaint was written and decisions to issue a refusal are not subject to reconsideration."[29] People denied exit visas must wait 6 months to reapply. Increasingly, those reapplying after the customary 6-month waiting period are being required to supply new documents, including new clearances from their places of employment and residences. Acquiring these new documents is time consuming and sometimes extremely difficult to fulfill. Often places of employment will supply the necessary clearance only if the applicant resigns, then refuse to provide the additional documentation once the applicant is no longer employed there. However, the new emigration law stipulates that old documents will be accepted fully or partially if there are no substantive changes.

In the event that an emigration application is accepted, the applicant must pay a number of high fees, including 270 rubles for the exit visa and, for the emigrant being issued an exit visa for Israel, 500 rubles to give up Soviet citizenship, as well as lesser fees representing over 4 months salary for the average Soviet worker. The Madrid Concluding Document obligates the participating States to reduce fees charged in connection with emigration "to bring them to a moderate level in relation to the average monthly income."

Despite Madrid Concluding Document pledges on family reunification that signatory states refrain from actions modifying rights to "employment, housing, residence status, family support, access to social, economic or educational benefits," the Soviets continue to subject applicants for emigration to a variety of punitive measures. Loss of employment or demotion at place of employment is one of the most common actions taken against applicants. After being fired, it is often impossible to find an equivalent job in one's field. Many scientists, artists, engineers and other professional people consider themselves fortunate to find manual work. Others, unable to find work, suffer serious financial hardship and are under the threat of being charged criminally with "parasitism."

Other punitive measures include the denial of higher education opportunities, including expulsion from universities; conscription of students who have been expelled from universities; the stripping of academic degrees; media vilification; and police harassment and surveillance, which includes interrogations, searches, confiscations of personal property, threats of criminal prosecution, arrests and imprisonment.

Soviet Jews

Estimates of the Jewish population in the Soviet Union range from 1.8 million (Soviet census) to 3 million. Over 260,000 Jews have emigrated since the late 1960's. Repatriation to their historic homeland initially served as a basis for Jewish emigration. Later, family reunification became the only legal grounds for emigration. Israel is the official destination for all Soviet Jews and invitations must come from Israel. However, over 90,000 have settled in the United States.

Since the signing of the Helsinki Final Act, the level of Jewish emigration, after an initial and marked increase, has declined precipitously. The all-time high was reached in 1979, when over 51,000 Soviet Jews left. In the 1980's, emigration declined to lows of 896 in 1984, 1,140 in 1985 and 914 in 1986. It is estimated that 383,000 Soviet Jews are in possession of a vyzov. While it is not known how many have actually applied or would apply if given the opportunity, it is probable that many are awaiting a more favorable climate before taking the risk to emigrate.

Soviet sources occasionally acknowledge that the numbers wishing to leave are high. According to a June 1986 *Wall Street Journal* article, "A leading Moscow expert on nationalities estimated at a recent lecture to the principal internal propaganda group, Znaniye, that between 10 percent and 15 percent of Soviet Jews wish to emigrate. This would mean a total ranging between 180,000 and 270,000 (based on 1979 census data)."[30] More often than not, however, Soviet officials continue to claim that all Jews who wished to leave the Soviet Union have been permitted to do so.

There are over 11,000 known Jewish refuseniks (those whose applications have been rejected but who have not abandoned the idea of emigrating), although estimates of refuseniks run as high as 20,000. Over 1,000 have been waiting to emigrate for more than 10 years.

Soviet Germans

Some 2 million ethnic Germans live in the Soviet Union, mostly in Russia and Central Asia. Since diplomatic relations were established between the FRG nd USSR in 1955, some 83,000 Germans have emigrated to West Germany, most having left following the Soviet-FRG Non Aggression Treaty signed in 1970. German emigration peaked in 1976 with 9,628. Since then, Soviet German emigration has steadily decreased to a low in 1985 of 406, its lowest level since 1970. In 1986, 753 ethnic Germans emigrated from the Soviet Union. The German Red Cross and other Western sources estimate that at least 150,000 ethnic Germans seek to resettle in the FRG, many of them for the purpose of family reunification. Similar tactics used to deter Jewish would-be emigrants are also used against Soviet Germans.

Soviet Armenians

The situation of the estimated 1.5 million Armenians in the Soviet Union differs from that of Soviet Jews or Germans. They have their own union republic, and are permitted to exercise a limited degree of political, cultural, linguistic and religious autonomy. The 23,000 Armenians who have left the Soviet Union since 1970 are entirely members of families which immigrated to the Soviet Union after World War II. Emigration expert Professor Sidney Heitman states that "Emigration for . . . (the Armenians) was also unthinkable, however, that is, until the Soviet Government began to permit Jews and Germans to emigrate, nominally for the purpose of family reunification. Armenians could also qualify on these grounds, for they had large, extended families throughout the world, and in the mid-1970's, they joined the exodus of Jews and Germans."[31]

The plunge in Armenian emigration has mirrored that of Jewish and German emigration. In 1985, only 109 Armenians were permitted to leave compared to the over 6,000 who left in 1980. In 1986, 247 Armenians emigrated to the United States. It is estimated that up to 200,000 others would leave for the West if permitted to do so.

Pentecostals

Soviet Pentecostals and Evangelical Protestants, estimated at 500,000 to 1 million, have long been subjected to persecution by the Soviet Government. As a result, about half of the Soviet Pentecostal communities are unregistered and live under the threat of imprisonment.

After losing thousands of their co-religionists in Stalin's camps, many Pentecostals decided after World War II that exodus from the USSR was their only salvation. Pentecostal emigration began in 1973 when two communities in the Soviet Far East, Nakhodka and Chernogorsk, applied for emigration permission. Soviet officials refused to accept their applications without *vyzovs* from relatives or from the governments of the countries to which they wanted to go.

During the 1970's, the Pentecostal emigration movement grew: in 1977, 1,000 Soviet Pentecostals declared their intention to emigrate; in 1979, there were about 30,000 would-be emigrants, despite the fact that very few were being granted permission to emigrate. Soviet repression and the imprisonment of leading emigration activists has led to a decrease in the numbers of Pentecostals applying to emigrate. Today, only about 6,000 Pentecostals are still actively seeking to leave the USSR.

Of the thousands who have applied, only a handful have been allowed to leave since the signing of the Final Act, the most notable being members of the Vashchenko and Chmykhailov families, five of whom took refuge in the US Embassy in Moscow for five years. They were permitted to emigrate in 1983.

In a 1985 letter to President Reagan, 18 Pentecostal families from the cities of Nakhodka and Vladivostok asked for renewed American help in their efforts to emigrate. Since the previous implementation report, Pentecostals in various cities, including Chuguevka, Rostov and Bataisk have continued to campaign for their emigration by staging hunger strikes.

Other Soviet Nationalities

Difficult as it is for Jews, Germans and Armenians to emigrate from the Soviet Union, it is virtually impossible for Russians, Ukrainians, Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians and members of other Soviet nationalities. Non-Jews who apply to emigrate from the USSR are often required to list Israel as their official destination. Political dissidents and human rights activists, including some members of the Helsinki Monitoring and affiliated groups, have attempted to emigrate in an effort to escape harassment or lengthy prison terms. Dissidents released from imprisonment under the February 1987 Supreme Soviet decrees who had attempted to emigrate, prior to their imprisonment have not yet reached the West.

Bilateral US-Soviet Cases

Direct emigration to the United States, consisting mostly of Armenians, has dropped sharply since 1981. (Direct emigration to the US includes persons who presented Soviet travel passports to the US Embassy in Moscow or who were stateless residents of the USSR, and not those who choose to come to the US even after leaving the USSR with visas for Israel.) In 1980, the peak year, 6,109 individuals emigrated from the USSR to the United States; in 1981—1,903; in 1982—490; in 1983—420; in 1984—181, in 1985—197 and in 1986—350.

The US Government has been presenting family reunification lists to the Soviets since the late 1950's. To qualify for inclusion on these lists families had to be denied permission to emigrate to the US on at least two occasions. From 1975 until 1981 the Soviets resolved annually between 15 and 30 percent of the US case list.

From 1981 to 1985 the percentage dropped to about 5 percent per year.

Within the last year, the Soviets have promised to resolve the highest number of US divided family cases ever. Following the November 1985 Reagan-Gorbachev summit the Soviet Government promised to resolve 33 divided family cases. As of September 1986, most had been resolved. The Soviets have also shown increased willingness to resolve difficult cases, i.e. the release of Shcharansky, permitting Elena Bonner to travel to the West, and granting exit permission to a small number of well-known Jewish refuseniks. In conjunction with the conclusion of the Bern Human Contacts Experts Meeting in May 1986, the Soviets promised to resolve 67 US-Soviet divided family cases representing 244 people. As of March 1987, about 50 of the total had been resolved.

Despite the recent promised resolution of the Bern cases (over one-third of the names included on the State Department's representation list), many family reunification cases involving first-degree relatives remain unresolved. As of March 1987, there were 116 families on the State Department's divided family list.

The longest standing unresolved family reunification case is that of Anatoly Michelson, whose wife Galina Goltsman and daughter in the USSR have been attempting to emigrate for over 30 years. Mr. Michelson left the Soviet Union without permission and subsequently moved to the US where he became a citizen. His wife and daughter have endured numerous hardships in their persistent efforts to reunite with their husband and father. Mr. Michelson is 69 years old. Both he and Mrs. Michelson are in poor health. Countless humanitarian appeals from various governmental and private entities have been made on their behalf. No substantive explanation has ever been offered by OVIR to justify the denial.

BINATIONAL MARRIAGES

The Soviet record of compliance with the binational marriage provision of the Final Act is better than its poor performance in family reunification, although longstanding unresolved cases remain. Since 1982, the vast majority of all US-Soviet binational marriage cases have been resolved favorably. Eighty to ninety percent of all Soviet spouses in US-Soviet binational marriage cases are able to obtain exit permission on either the first or second application. On the average, exit permission is granted to Soviet spouses within 4 months.

Marriage in the Soviet Union normally requires two trips for the prospective US spouse—the registration trip and the wedding trip. During the first trip, the prospective bride an groom apply in person at the ZAGS office (civil registry which has jurisdiction over the legal residence of the Soviet citizen). Under Soviet law, a marriage date is then set by authorities, normally about 90 days from the date of registration. The fiance, then, is compelled to return to the US, his/her visa having expired, apply for a second visa, and make another trip to the Soviet Union for the wedding.

On June 1, 1984, the Soviets introduced new procedures for foreigners in obtaining a visa for the second (wedding) trip which are designed to make it more difficult for US citizens to enter the

USSR to marry Soviet citizens. According to the new regulations, individuals going to the USSR to be married are instructed to obtain a private visitor's visa as opposed to a tourist visa. Because it takes OVIR 2 to 6 months to authorize a visitors visa, a prospective spouse may not be able to obtain permission to travel in time for the scheduled wedding date. While few US citizens have been required to obtain visitor's visas since June 1984, there is concern that the Soviets have established an effective, albeit irregular, mechanism for blocking marriages.

Ten to twenty percent of Soviet spouses of US citizens encounter difficulties in leaving the USSR and are refused permission to emigrate, often for reasons that are unclear. As of March 1987, there were 11 individuals on the list maintained by the State Department of cases in which the Soviet spouse of a US citizen has had at least two applications for exit permission denied by Soviet officials. Most are binational marriage cases and the remainder are persons who left the Soviet Union, and who have since become US citizens through naturalization. Despite the resolution of 18 cases since the November 1985 Reagan-Gorbachev summit, longstanding cases remain unresolved.

Currently, there are four blocked marriages, including that of Elizabeth Condon and Viktor Novikov. Soviet authorities have prevented them from seeing each other since 1979. Ms. Condon consistently has been denied visas to enter the Soviet Union, often on the grounds that it was "not expedient at this time." At times, US citizens have been denied Soviet entry visas to visit spouses at the same time the Soviet spouses were being denied exit permission abroad. As a result, in some instances, both spouses and their children have been barred from seeing each other.

The Soviet treatment of separated spouses in binational marriage cases parallels that of family reunification cases. Separated spouses regularly lose their jobs because of a marriage to an American and the subsequent application for exit permission. For example, Yuriy Balovlenkov, one of the longest standing binational marriage/divided spouses cases, lost his job as a computer operator after his marriage to a US citizen in 1978.

Reasons cited by Soviet authorities for refusing exit permission for spouses in US-Soviet binational marriage cases parallel those for other types of cases. Several separated spouses, including Matvey Finkel (married since 1979), continue to be denied exit permission on security grounds, even though their previous security clearances are over 10 years old. Others, including Svetlana Braun, have been told that their applications were refused due to the "poor state of US-Soviet bilateral relations," or because it is "inconvenient to the Soviet state." Often, no explanation for refusal is provided.

RELIGIOUS CONTACTS

There has been an increase in official contacts among religious organizations in the Soviet Union and their counterparts in the West since the Commission's previous implementation report, although the level of contacts is less than in the mid- and late-1970's.

Among the many US religious representatives active in exchanges with the Soviet Union is the National Council of Churches of Christ (NCCC). The NCCC is part of the World Council of Churches. Responding to a request from the Russian Orthodox Church, the NCCC in early 1984 opened a special office to coordinate programs of visits and exchanges with churches in the USSR. In May 1984, the NCCC sponsored a visit to the US of 20 Soviet representatives of the Russian Orthodox, Georgian Orthodox, Lutheran, Baptist, Armenian Apostolic and Jewish faiths. These official Soviet religious leaders met with local religious communities around the US and made a presentation at the NCCC board meeting in Louisville, KY.

In June 1984, the largest American church group ever to visit the Soviet union—266 leaders from all parts of the US, including members of Protestant, Anglican, Orthodox and Roman Catholic faiths—toured the Soviet Union for 17 days. Sponsored by the NCCC, the trip was arranged with the cooperation of "Intourist" and the officially recognized Soviet churches. Members of the delegation divided into 10 groups and visited Russian Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Lutheran, Pentecostal and Baptist churches in 14 Soviet cities.

In October 1984, a group of Russian Orthodox seminary students visited seminaries and theological schools in the United States and US church leaders toured the Soviet Union to mark the tenth anniversary of such exchanges between the NCCC and Soviet churches.

In August 1985, at the invitation of the Russian Orthodox Church, a group of over 80 leaders and representatives of various church organizations in the United States spent 2 weeks in the Soviet Union. They visited Moscow, Leningrad and the monastery at Zagorsk. The American delegation was led by Martin Bailey, General Secretary of the National Council of Churches.

In June-July 1986, under the sponsorship of the NCCC, 137 US church members visited churches in Moscow, Zagorsk and Leningrad. Smaller groups made regional visits to other Soviet cities.

A few months later in October 1986, 17 church leaders and theologians representing a variety of Soviet churches visited the US for the Decennial Visit of Church Leaders. The group visited Chicago and New York and then branched out in groups of two or three to meet with American ecumenical leaders nationwide.

The 1988 theme of Friendship Press, the NCCC's church education material, will be the Soviet Union and its churches. Approximately 65 Americans will visit the Soviet Union in May 1987 to be trained as leaders on the subject.

Also in 1988, the NCCC will sponsor three pilgrimages to the Soviet Union to commemorate the Millennium of Kievan Rus'.

American Lutherans have maintained and expanded contacts with co-religionists and members of other faiths in the USSR. In April 1984, Bishop James Crumley, Jr., of the Lutheran Church in America went on a 4-day visit to the USSR as part of an American Lutheran delegation. While in the Soviet Union, Bishop Crumley met with Patriarch Pimen of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Lutheran delegation visited the Russian Orthodox monastery in Zagorsk, to which they donated some books and discussed the possibility of sending a Lutheran professor to the monastery.

Various Baptist leaders have continued to be actively involved in exchanges with the Soviet Union. In 1984, a number of Soviet Baptist leaders visited various US Baptist churches. Also, in September 1984, at the invitation of the Russian Orthodox Church and the official Soviet Baptist group (AUCECB), Evangelist Billy Graham conducted a 12-day preaching tour in the USSR. Dr. Graham gave sermons in over 20 Russian Orthodox and Baptist churches in four cities—Moscow, Leningrad, Tallinn and Novosibirsk—on his itinerary.

There has been an increase in the sending of religious materials from denominations in the West to their co-religionists in the Soviet Union. Since 1982, over 5,000 copies of Braille editions of parts of the New Testament have been sent by the United Bible Society to the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists (AUCECB).

In 1985, the AUCECB received permission from the Soviet Government to import 1,000 copies of five different volumes of New Testament commentaries translated and produced in a 6-year joint project of the Baptist World Alliance and the Mennonite Central Committee.

Despite some improvement in religious contacts, serious problem areas remain. The Soviet Government approves contacts with religious roups in the West as long as only approved representatives of officially recognized churches participate. The Soviet Government restricts travel by representatives of certain religious denominations. In 1983, for instance, Lithuanian and Latvian Catholic Bishops were not allowed to attend the World Synod of Catholic Bishops at which over 200 bishops, representing various countries of the world, took part. Also, in 1984, Soviet authorities denied a visit of Pope John Paul II to Lithuania.

In February 1987, however, Lithuanian Catholic Archbishop Liudas Povilonis visited the Vatican. According to Keston College, "the Archbishop's presence in Rome indicates that the Soviet authorities have thought better of their earlier threat to forbid the Lithuanian clergy to travel abroad this year."

FAMILY VISITS

Soviet policies, in stark contrast with commitments under the Helsinki Final Act and Madrid Concluding Document, prevent millions of relatives from many national and ethnic groups from maintaining normal contact with one another. The Soviet record in this area since the previous 1982 implementation report has remained poor.

Soviet Visits to United States

The Soviet Government's record in the area of allowing families to visit their relatives in the United States is grossly inadequate. It makes no pretense that it grants citizens a general right to travel abroad, and decisions in individual cases are often arbitrary or based on underlying political considerations. Permission, when obtained, is regarded as an exceptional benefit to the recipient—a rare privilege rather than a right. Very few Soviet citizens are granted permission to visit relatives in the United States and the privileged few are mostly retired and have close family members in the United States. It is Soviet practice not to allow the entire family permission to travel to ensure the return of the visitor.

Since 1975, approximately 1,500 Soviet citizens annually have received permission to travel to the United States for private, mostly family, visits. When compared to the pre-1975 aggregate levels, there has been a modest increase in the number of Soviets permitted to visit family members in the United States. However, the number of private visits has declined from 2,283 in the peak year of 1979 to approximately 1,400 annually for 1983 to 1985. During the year ending September 31, 1986, the US issued visas to 1,774 Soviet citizens for private visits to the United States, a modest increase over the last few years. There are no available figures or estimates on the number of Soviet citizens who have been refused travel permission to visit relatives in the United States.

Rules and Procedures

Obtaining permission for a family visit is lengthy, costly, burdensome and arbitrary. There is no official information available to applicants regarding rules and regulations which govern the granting of visitor's visas abroad. Therefore, applicants have no legal recourse when their visas are denied.

Regarding application procedures, Soviets seeking permission to visit relatives in the United States must obtain notarized invitations from their relatives and submit them to their local Office of Visas and Registration (OVIR). In addition, local OVIRs require detailed applications and such documents as character references from applicants' workplaces and residences; forms showing approval of vacation plans; and birth or marriage certificates to prove their relationship to the people they seek to visit. Applicants usually wait 3 to 6 months to receive exit permission. In extraordinary cases of family emergencies, exit permission may be granted very quickly--or not at all. In one instance, the 76-year-old mother of a US citizen was told that she could not visit her son because she was "not a close enough relative."[32]

Families targeted to receive the greatest amount of difficulty are those whose relatives in the West left illegally or those who served in labor camps, including those who were imprisoned under Stalin and who were amnestied in 1956.

Clearly, this complex and expensive process (Soviet citizens must pay 200 rubles for a passport) serves as a deterrent to Soviet citizens wishing to acquire a visitor's visa abroad. Eighty-seven-year-old Yelena Sofronitskaya of Moscow has been denied permission to travel to the United States for a visit with her only daughter and grandchildren for 11 years. Soviet officials, when they denied her visitor's visa, told Mrs. Sofronitskaya to emigrate to Israel if she wanted to see her family, even though she is not Jewish and does not want to emigrate. Mrs. Sofronitskaya was most recently denied permission to travel in June 1986 without explanation.

Dan Horodysky of Berkeley, CA, twice applied for a visitors visas on behalf of his Ukrainian niece, Hanna Malitska. Her requests were ignored and after the second invitation was sent in 1981, she was warned to stop her efforts to visit or be in "big trouble."

Velta and Edward Ozolins have tried numerous times since 1975 to obtain a visitor's visa for 66-year-old Valentins Ozolins of Latvia. As happened with so many families, Valentins Ozolins was separated from his wife and 2-year-old daughter at the end of World War II. His daughter, grandchildren and brother, whom he has not seen in over 40 years, live in the United States. The last time a visa was denied him, Valentins was told, "Your visiting the US is undesirable," that is a very common reason for refusal, when reasons are even given.

Visits to the USSR

In 1985, over 50,000 Americans visited the Soviet Union. It is not clear how many of these Americans visited relatives, although a reasonable estimate is in the tens of thousands. While these numbers represent an increase over the approximately 28,000 in 1982, 38,000 in 1983 and 35,000 in 1984, significant problems remain.

There are two ways for Americans to visit relatives in the USSR. The first is to obtain a private visa to a person's home. The second is to take 3 to 4 day tour to one of the 80 Intourist cities that may be near their relatives.

The privilege of staying with relatives in their homes by visitors to the USSR is rare. In order to obtain a private visitors visa to a relative's home, an American must complete an application form in Russian and send three copies with photographs to the Soviet consulate for verification and registration and send a completed application to one's relative. The relative must submit that application to local authorities for consideration. According to the Soviet consulate's instructions for prospective visitors: "It may take more than four months for your application to be processed . . . All information regarding status of application has to be provided by your relatives . . . in contact with the authorities in charge." The instructions then go on to say: "In case you do not want to wait for a visitor permit you may arrange to go to the USSR as a tourist within a couple of weeks and meet your relatives in one of the points included in your route of journey."

Consideration of visitors visa applications is often a slow process, and they may be denied or not acted upon at all. Given this uncertainty, most Americans who wish to visit relatives in the Soviet Union take the tourist visa. However, the tourist visa as a vehicle for facilitating visits with relatives is limited.

Although tourists theoretically may visit any open area of the USSR, in fact they are restricted to roughly 5 percent of the country where the official Soviet tourist agency Intourist provides services. As a result, tourists encounter difficulties in meeting relatives under normal circumstances. Authorization to travel outside tour cities is difficult to receive. Thus, visitors are thereby prevented from visiting their families' homes, villages or gravesites. In one case, a US tourist applied for special permission to see his dying mother when he arranged his tour. His mother lived 60 miles outside a tour city. He finally received this permission about an hour before his scheduled departure from the tour city—too late to make the trip.

Most of those visiting relatives do so during the course of a tour. Soviet relatives are forced to travel to the designated tour city, sometimes daily, to meet. Those able to make the journey are sometimes chased out of Intourist hotel lobbies. In one instance, an 84-year-old woman traveled to meet her American son in Kiev. The Intourist hotel would not permit her to spend the night in his room and she was forced to sleep on a bench.

Former Soviet citizens who left the USSR legally under Jewish emigration status during the last 15 years and who now reside in the United States are routinely denied permission to travel to the USSR, even as tourists. These families are particularly affected since they have been separated from their remaining relatives for a shorter period of time than descendents of those who emigrated in previous generations. Furthermore, many have parents and other relatives in the Soviet Union who are old and sick. For example, a professor at a US university has twice been denied an entry visa to visit his old and ill father in the Soviet Union. The professor is a former Soviet citizen who emigrated legally in 1975 and has been a US citizen since 1981.

TRAVEL AND TOURISM

The Soviet Union continues to maintain strict restrictions on travel abroad. The Soviet Union does not permit personal or professional travel abroad by its citizens except under conditions of stringent government control. The vast majority of Soviet citizens permitted to travel to the United States do so only for purposes sanctioned by the state. Close to one-half of the non-immigrant visas issued to Soviet travelers are for diplomats and visits connected with the United Nations while another one-third are for private visits, including family and tourism.

The number of B-2 visas issued to Soviets, remained consistently low for most of the reporting period. B-2 visas are entry visas for "temporary visits for pleasure" including private visits and tourism. In 1982, 2,570 Soviet citizens were issued B-2 visas to the United States; in 1983—2,350; in 1984—1,897 and in 1985—2,338. In 1986, however, 3,003 Soviet citizens were issued B-2 visas.

Travel for professional reasons continues to be closely controlled by the Soviet Government. Soviet scholars, particularly refuseniks, have been refused exit visas to take up offers of visiting professorships in the United States. Others continue to be denied permission to participate in scientific conferences abroad to which they were invited.

Even when permission to travel abroad is deemed necessary by the state, numerous restrictions abound. According to Lieutenant Didzis Rozenbergs, a Latvian sailor who defected in Antwerp from a Soviet commercial ship in December 1985, sailors must sign a so-called Sailor's Code of Ethics in Foreign Countries. "One of the stipulations in this code is that a Soviet sailor whose ship is docked at a foreign port may not, under any circumstances, have contact with local inhabitants, or with any other people who are not Soviet citizens."[33]

Generally, the Soviet Union encourages visits by westerners as a source of hard currency. No direct means exist to ascertain the number of American tourists and other visitors to the USSR. According to a compilation of both official and unofficial estimates, the number of US visitors traveling to the Soviet Union has increased substantially since the last implementation report, from 28,000 in 1982; to 38,000 in 1983; to 45,000 in 1984; and to 80,000 in 1985. However, in 1986, following the Chernobyl accident, many hundreds of American tourists cancelled their bookings as the seriousness of the accident became known.

American travelers in the Soviet Union face a wide variety of restrictions. About 20 percent of the country is closed entirely to foreigners. Foreign tourists in the Soviet Union are required to use Intourist accommodations and approved foreign transportation routes, resulting in the closing of another 75 percent of Soviet territory. Thus only 5 percent of the USSR is actually open to tourists. Only in exceptional cases, usually private visits, may a tourist visit an area not normally covered by Intourist.

Soviet authorities have no currency conversion requirements for tourists. However, virtually all tourists must plan their itineraries and pay for transportation and accommodations before a visa is issued. Changing an itinerary once a visa has been issued and the tourist has arrived in the country is difficult. Further barriers to normal tourism are imposed by strict and often harshly applied customs regulations.

As noted earlier in the Family Reunification/Emigration section, a Soviet decree of May 25, 1984 established fines of up to 100 rubles for Soviet citizens violating rules of stay for foreigners in the Soviet Union, including fines for providing foreigners with "housing or means of transportation or other services" in violation of unspecified "established regulations." Instead, foreigners are often restricted to Intourist hotels, many of which are closed to most Soviet citizens.

Since the last implementation report, there have been numerous instances of Soviet harassment of tourists. Tourists visiting refuseniks are often placed under surveillance. Some have been expelled for allegedly carrying "Zionist propaganda" or "propaganda literature of a nationalist content."

"In May 1985, an American tourist was detained at the Sheremetyevo Airport in Moscow when entering the USSR with several English and Russian language copies of the Sermon on the Mount. She was detained for 3 hours, strip-searched and expelled from the USSR. on the grounds that she had been trying to bring in "anti-Soviet materials."[34]

In June 1984, the State Department issued a travel advisory urging caution for Americans traveling to Leningrad as a result of several assaults on Americans. The travel advisory noted that there had been an increase "in the number of incidents of harassment involving Americans in the Soviet Union," and that there had been cases of illegal detention of tourists "following innocent contacts with Soviet citizens." Among those that had been beaten and detained was a US Marine who was seized by the police, beaten and detained briefly and a Chicago student who was beaten following visits to refuseniks. Among other instances of harassment.

"In April 1984, two American tourists from Houston were interrogated in customs in Leningrad on arrival. They were strip searched and Jewish religious material and cassettes they were carrying were confiscated. In November 1984 Art Agnos, a member of the California State Assembly, was forcibly detained on leaving Leningrad Airport, strip-searched, and micro-cassettes in his possession were confiscated. He was not permitted to call the American Consulate during interrogation."[35]

Despite the March 6, 1985 lifting of the Leningrad advisory, instances of harassment and intimidation by Soviet authorities of tourists who had met privately with Soviet citizens continue.

Americans wishing to travel to the Soviet Union for professional reasons have also been denied entry visas to the USSR. In May 1985, Dr. Joshua Fishman, a sociolinguist from Yeshiva University, was refused a visa to participate in an IREX exchange with the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute of Linguistic Studies. When pressed by IREX for the reason, the Soviets answered that "he should know." (Fishman had stated on his visa application that he was a Yiddishist who wished to meet with colleagues.)[36] Other professionals refused visas to enter the USSR include Professor Joel Lebowitz, a Rutgers University math professor, denied a visa in 1985 to attend a mathematical symposium without any explanation.

CHAPTER TWO—INFORMATION

INTRODUCTION

The intent of this section of the Helsinki Final Act is to promote the development of greater mutual understanding among the peoples of the signatory countries through the freer flow and wider dissemination of information of all kinds. The CSCE signatories expressed at Helsinki and reaffirmed at Madrid their conviction that implementation of the Final Act's information provisions would contribute to the growth of international confidence through greater openness. Progress in the information field, therefore, can serve to strengthen bilateral relations between CSCE states.

The Helsinki Final Act specifically refers to communication through lecture series and seminars, the circulation and translation of publications and the dissemination of filmed and broadcast information. It also encourages cooperation among mass media organizations, press agencies and publishing houses. Finally, the Final Act calls for improvement in the working conditions of foreign journalists.

At the Madrid Meeting, the East resisted efforts by the West to include new commitments against jamming. The Madrid Concluding Document does contain a number of provisions which strengthen the Final Act in other areas. Included among these are provisions that commit the participating States to: encourage the sale and distribution of printed matter from other states; decide journalists' visa applications without undue delay; grant permanent correspondents and their families multiple-entry and -exit visas valid for a year; provide more extensive travel opportunities for journalists; increase possibilities for foreign journalists to establish contacts with sources; and, allow journalists to carry with them reference material and personal notes.

Implicit in the CSCE information provision is the recognition that the degree of progress in a given signatory country necessarily depends on the nature of its state system. In the West, governments have engaged in official programs to facilitate information flow, but initiatives chiefly have been taken by the private sector independently of the state and are subject only to commercial constraints such as consumer demand for Eastern products and ability of Eastern parties to pay in hard currency for publications, films and other items produced in the West.

In the Soviet Union and other Eastern European nations, any advancement in the field of information requires the political sanction of, and action by, the Government. The Eastern signatories' approach to information issues is graphically illustrated by their longstanding efforts in Unesco and other international bodies to strengthen government control over information content and flow, both domestically and internationally.

From CSCE's outset, implementation of the Helsinki and Madrid provisions in the information field has been heavily conditioned by the differing interpretations of the proper role of the media in East and West. The Western view maintains that compliance with the Helsinki and Madrid documents requires the removal of all artificial obstacles to the free flow of people, facts and ideas as well as the unrestricted access of citizens to those ideas and facts.

As President Reagan said in his November 14, 1985 pre-summit address to the Nation on people-to-people contacts: "In communications, we'd like to see more appearances in the other's mass media by representatives of both our countries. If Soviet spokesmen are free to appear on American television, to be published and read in the American press, shouldn't the Soviet people have the same right to see, hear, and read what we Americans have to say? Such proposals will not bridge our differences, but people-to-people contacts can build genuine constituencies for peace in both countries."

In contrast, the Eastern view insists that information must contribute to the goal of mutual understanding; understanding among peoples is not served by information deemed unsuitable by the State. Only information that is non-controversial and positive by the State's standards and definitions is to be made available; the State has a responsibility to protect citizens from war propaganda and material that promotes racial intolerance, violations of human dignity and immorality.

OVERVIEW OF TRENDS SINCE 1982

In the post-Madrid period, the experience of the United States and other Western countries overwhelmingly attests to the fact that progress in the information field remains very limited.

Nevertheless, the modest gains recorded prior to the Final Act's signing in 1975, and particularly following the onset of detente, have been maintained. Other marginal measures subsequently have been taken, some of them motivated by the desire to improve the East-West atmosphere by means of "confidence-building" gestures in the information field.

The 1985 US-USSR General Agreement on Contacts, Exchanges and Cooperation in Scientific, Technical, Educational, Cultural and

Other Fields signed at the Geneva summit referred specifically "to the relevant principles, provisions and objectives set forth in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe" and included commitments regarding filmed and broadcast information (article VI); printed information and publishing (article VIII) and cooperative efforts such as exchanges and meetings of journalists, editors and publishers (article VIII).

Increasingly, the Soviet Union has utilized advances in satellite communication technology to disseminate its peace propaganda and improve its image in the West. For example, on October 2, 1985, an hour-long interview with the Soviet leader was broadcast simultaneously in the USSR and in France. Significantly, it was the first time the Soviet public could see the new leader, or any leader in recent history, up close for a sustained period of time. In the wake of the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear disaster, Soviet spokesmen and commentators made frequent appearances in the Western mass media, often *via* satellite hookup, in an apparent effort to limit international public relations damage and fill the embarrassing information vacuum for which the Soviet Union had been widely castigated. By the same token, as part of Gorbachev's activist public relations campaign, the Soviets have gone on the offensive against US media which, they charge, spawn a pathology of hatred against the USSR. Films such as "Rambo," "Red Dawn," "Rocky IV" and the ABC television film "Ameryka," which describes the United States 10 years after it has fallen to the Soviet Union without a fight, have been singled out for criticism.

The internal dissemination of information remains under strict state control in the Soviet Union and most of Eastern Europe. These governments continue to utilize a powerful censorship apparatus to insure that all materials published or broadcast conform to ideological standards. To the extent possible, information from foreign sources is strictly limited and controlled. Prior to the Reagan-Gorbachev Summit, the first published interview with a US President in 24 years appeared in the Government daily *Izvestia* on November 5, but no indication was given that the most sensitive sections of Reagan's remarks had been omitted entirely. A rebuttal by the four Soviet interviewers covered the opposite page. Ordinary citizens still have great difficulty in acquiring Western publications. Those that are available are primarily publications of pro-Soviet Communist Parties in the West. The Western films that are occasionally shown on TV or in movie houses in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe generally appear to be chosen because they are innocuous or portray life in the West in a negative light. When deemed necessary, they are edited to conform to Eastern ideological conceptions. With the exception of Hungary, Romania and the GDR, the Soviet Union and all other Warsaw Pact countries continue selectively to jam Western radio broadcasts.

Since 1982, in contravention of Helsinki and Madrid commitments, some Eastern signatories deliberately have taken measures to impede or directly to prevent, rather than to facilitate, the flow of information and ideas across their borders. Eastern governments have passed laws designed to restrict foreigners' access to unofficial sources within their countries. The Soviet Union and other East Bloc countries engage in ongoing efforts to eradicate unofficial or underground (*samizdat*) publications, with varying degrees of success from country to country. For example, in the Soviet Union, the editorial staffs of *samizdat* publications are constantly changing due to the arrest and imprisonment of their members. In Poland, where *samizdat* publications have been substantially increasing since the 1970's, unofficial publishing activity actually increased following the imposition of martial law and its aftermath and has become the principal tool of the social opposition. At the same time, unofficial publishers have been primary targets for arrest.

As the frameup and arrest on August 30, 1986 of *U.S. News and World Report* correspondent Nicholas Daniloff graphically illustrates, East bloc governments continue to target foreign correspondents on politically-motivated grounds. As the 29 American journalists in Moscow observed in their letter to Gorbachev: ". . . The actions against Mr. Daniloff are an attempt to intimidate every member of the media community in Moscow. They hamper us in performing our professional responsibilities, thus violating the Helsinki accords of 1975 that were signed by the Soviet Union . . ."

The US Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, in a special report to the President on *Soviet Advocacy and the U.S. Media* (Washington, D.C., October 1986), criticized Soviet exploitation of US media openness and failure to allow meaningful access by US journalists and official spokesmen to the Soviet public. The independent, bipartisan Commission, established by the US Congress to oversee activities of the US Information Agency, strongly advocated strict reciprocal access. Presenting the report on October 8, the Commission Chairman, Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., stated: "We do not believe that the present asymmetry in the exchange of information between the US and the Soviet Union should be accepted by this country. Just as we should permit Soviet journalists, properly identified as spokesmen of the Soviet Government, to speak to the American people, the United States in turn should be permitted to bring its ideas and perspectives to the Soviet people on a regular and continuing basis. With few exceptions, that is not happening."

DISSEMINATION AND EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

Oral Information

The Helsinki signatory states expressed their intention "to facilitate the dissemination of oral information through the encouragement of lectures and lecture tours by personalities and specialists from the other participating States, as well as exchanges of opinions at round table meetings, seminars, symposia, summer schools, congresses and other bilateral and multilateral meetings."

The US Government has fostered the East-West dissemination of oral information chiefly by means of three programs: the American Participant (AmPart) Program, the International Visitors Program (IVP) and the Fulbright Lecturer Program.

Subject to the approval of Eastern host governments, the US Information Agency's AmPart Program sends American private sector and government experts in science, technology, economics, cultural and other fields on foreign lecture tours of brief duration.

In cooperation with institutions in the host country, Public Affairs Officers serving in US Embassies abroad handle local arrangements for AmPart lecturers.

The extent of the AmPart exchange both reflects and contributes to the overall quality of an Eastern country's bilateral relationship with the United States. The AmPart Program has been particularly successful in Hungary and Romania, countries with which the United States has extensive bilateral exchange relations.

AMPART LECTURERS

Countries	Fiscal Years				
	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
Bulgaria	2	8	9	3	3
Czechoslovakia	5	8	12	17	6
GDR	10	18	18	17	9
Hungary	14	16	17	9	9
Poland	8	4	3	8	6
Romania	10	13	14	11	13
USSR	7	13	9	9	10

Consistent with the Final Act's information provisions, the IVP, begun in 1948 and presently administered by the USIA, aims to strengthen and improve mutual understanding between current and potential leaders and decision makers of foreign nations and the people of the United States. Through professional and social contacts with Americans, the participants (approximately 2,000 annually from around the world) are able to gain an indepth understanding of the United States, its people, its character and its institutions.

The number of Soviet IVP participants peaked in 1979 at 70, but abruptly declined after the deterioration in East-West relations following the invasion of Afghanistan. Soviet numbers have been extremely low ever since, averaging the lowest per year of any East Bloc country. Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and the GDR continue to send small numbers of visitors. Hungary, Poland and Romania consistently send the most. However, Poland continues to inhibit the IVP by forbidding Poles to accept official invitations from the US Government.

IVP Participants

Countries	Fiscal Years				
	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
Bulgaria	7	6	7	10	11
Czechoslovakia	2	5	5	9	9
GDR	5	6	5	6	6
Hungary	24	23	23	26	22
Poland	17	18	18	21	24
Romania	18	21	20	16	11
USSR	5	1	1	1	3

Printed Information

Final Act and subsequent Madrid provisions urging the wider dissemination of newspapers and periodicals call on the participating States to undertake two actions: (1) gradually to increase the quantities and the numbers of titles of publications imported from other signatories; and (2) to contribute to the improvement of access by the public to these publications. Simply to increase the number of copies which are imported, without at the same time making those publications more accessible to the majority of citizens does not constitute compliance.

Newspapers and Periodicals

A comprehensive and definitive measurement of newspaper and periodical flow between East and West is unavailable, but the total volume clearly remains insubstantial.

Over and above the small number of US newspapers and magazines which are imported into the Warsaw Pact countries, the critical factor in terms of compliance with the Final Act is the extent to which they are made available to the general public. The participating States agreed in Basket III "to facilitate the improvement of the dissemination, on their territory, of newspapers and printed publications . . . from the other participating States" by encouraging "an increase in the number of places where they can be sold" and "improving the opportunities for reading and borrowing these publications in large public libraries and their reading rooms as well as in university libraries." In addition, the states agreed to expand subscription opportunities (understood in the context of the language of the provision as opportunities for private individuals) and to "improve the possibilities for acquaintance with bulletins of official information issued and distributed by diplomatic missions on the basis of bilateral agreements."

Except for the last commitment with respect to distribution of official materials, compliance with these provisions by the Warsaw Pact countries is dismal. Access of the average citizen to Western publications is virtually no better than it was at the time of the signing of the Final Act. Implementation in Hungary and in Poland remains considerably better than in the rest of the Warsaw Pact.

Observers continue to report that Western publications can be found only in the major hotels of the largest cities, usually the capital, and occasionally in the main tourist centers. They tend to be kept under the counter and are sold almost exclusively to foreign tourists who can pay in hard currency. In every country but Hungary and Poland, Western publications are held in "closed stacks" of public and university libraries. Access to them is restricted to those with special passes. Entry by ordinary citizens into American Embassy and consulate libraries, where not prohibited by local authorities, tends to be so closely watched as to discourage use of the libraries. Only in Romania is an American library located elsewhere than on Embassy premises.

Despite the 1983 Madrid provision confirming signatories' intention "to further extend the possibilities for the public to take out subscriptions," private individuals are prohibited in most of the

Warsaw Pact countries from subscribing to Western publications. Even where not forbidden, the difficulties of obtaining the necessary foreign exchange for purchase, poses insurmountable obstacles to potential subscribers.

Bulgaria. No Western periodicals, except those published by Western Communist Parties, are sold or otherwise made available. When foreign publications are provided for westerners participating in conferences, Bulgarian citizens are denied access to these publications. A number of carefully selected articles from the American and Western press are translated and reprinted in Bulgarian publications.

CSSR. There are no US publications sold openly in Czechoslovakia except for a few copies of the US Communist Party newspaper *Daily World*, which are seen on newsstands irregularly. One major hotel, the Jalta, occasionally puts on display outdated newspapers from the West, presumably left by guests. The *Financial Times* is available irregularly at the Prague Airport and at some hotels catering to westerners. From time to time, a half dozen West German fashion, sport and other nonpolitical magazines are sold by one Prague newsdealer. The US Embassy's Press and Cultural Section distributes 164 subscriptions to American periodicals (105 titles) to CSSR citizens and institutions under a periodical presentation program. However, individual subscriptions to American magazines, US Embassy "outreach" materials, the USIA Czech-language magazine *Spektrum* and other publications often are interrupted.

The 1983 directive issued by the CSSR Ministry of Communications and the Federal Office for Press and Information that changes the terms of payment for subscriptions to periodicals from Western countries from CSSR koruna to US dollars or other convertible currency is still in force. Since payment by individuals and institutions (even those relatively few who are permitted access to Western publications) is a real burden, the long-term result of the directive probably has been a substantial reduction in the number and variety of Western publications available in the CSSR.

GDR. Only publications listed in the GDR's postal publication register may be imported. Materials not so listed are regularly confiscated at border or sector crossings. The US Embassy in Berlin has been able to distribute to official and unofficial contacts a variety of printed materials, including the USIA-produced magazines *Dialogue*, *English Teaching Forum*, and *Problems of Communism*. These publications usually reach their recipients, whether mailed or delivered by hand.

US magazines and newspapers, other than those published by the US Communist Party, are not available to the general public. Libraries and official institutes do receive US magazines, scholarly journals and daily papers. Circulation of these publications, even within those university sections or institutions permitted to subscribe to them, is restricted. Small numbers of The *International Herald Tribune* and other Western papers also are sold upon request for hard currency to foreigners in a few hotels catering to Western visitors.

It is difficult to purchase US books and periodicals at bookstores and newsstands. Circulation of US materials in libraries is restricted. Only a very few researchers and scholars receive subscriptions to US publications. Although due in part to the difficulty of paying for them in hard currency, the small number of subscribers also reflects official reluctance to grant the postal license necessary to receive such materials through the mail. Visitors are occasionally permitted access to the US Embassy's library facility to attend a special event, not merely to use the materials.

Hungary. Publications from the West long have been available for forints at major international hotels in Hungary, and, since the Budapest Cultural Forum of the CSCE, at newsstands throughout the city. Western publications that contain articles embarrassing to the state do not appear in any case. Hungarian citizens can subscribe to Western periodicals, paying in forints. The US Embassy library reportedly receives the *International Herald Tribune*, the Sunday *New York Times*, *USA Today*, and a full range of magazines, but these are read mostly by younger people. The Embassy deals with over 1,000 readers every month and the Embassy's table-of-contents service continues to be popular and well-used. Since the fall of 1985, a Hungarian edition of *Scientific American* has been published in Budapest, with a circulation of 35,000.

Poland. The official press toes the Government line on international issues, but the press continues to be a forum for debate on many domestic issues. There is no public sale of US periodicals in Poland, although some US weeklies are found in public reading rooms. The public sale of East bloc publications is widespread. Personal and institutional subscriptions to Western publications are theoretically possible, but control of hard currency expenditure outside of Poland makes it exceedingly difficult for an individual to subscribe to an American periodical. Gift subscriptions usually arrive through the mail, but there are exceptions. The USIA-produced *Ameryka* and *Problems of Communism* continue to be banned from distribution.

Romania. No Western periodicals or publications are sold to the general public, nor are they available at hotels for foreigners. However, a variety of technical journals and other publications in limited quantities are available to selected government and party officials, academicians and scientific researchers. Limited numbers of Romanians gain access to Western publications through foreign missions' information centers and libraries. A few Romanians have subscriptions to Western periodicals, usually individually purchased during foreign travel. The Romanian Government does not grant permits for its citizens to use foreign exchange for Western periodical subscriptions.

The Soviet Union. US newspapers and magazines are not available at Soviet newsstands, with the exception of very rare copies of US Communist newspapers. Official and some other resident Americans in the USSR can receive Western newspapers and magazines through the Soviet mail. Otherwise, non-Communist newspapers and magazines are circulated only among a select elite and are treated as confidential material.

America Illustrated magazine is available in extremely limited quantities for newsstand sales, in addition to a limited number available through the Soviet distribution system. A large number of copies of each issue are returned "unsold." The Soviet state organization which makes newspaper and magazine subscriptions available to the public lists for the US only technical, scientific and Communist periodicals, at costs considerably higher than for domestic and East European journals. In January 1983, *Scientific American*, a comprehensive science monthly, reached a licensing agreement with the Soviet publishing house Mir and with VAAP, the Soviet copyright authority, for a Russian-language edition of the noted US journal to be sold in the USSR.

US citizens may obtain Soviet publications in translation and in the original through specialized bookstores and subscription agencies. Also by subscription, the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, with summaries of key articles from 95 Soviet publications, is available to the American public.

Books

In debates with Western governments about the modest book trade between East and West, the Soviet Union and other East bloc governments inevitably cite statistics about the number of Western authors and titles published in the original and in translation in their countries and the paucity of Eastern authors published in the United States. However, studies by leading US experts such as Leo Gruliow, a member of the US delegation to the Budapest Cultural Forum of the CSCE, and by University of Illinois Professor Maurice Friedberg, show that the alleged imbalance is deceiving.

Despite highly competitive Western commercial markets, the availability of works by Eastern classical writers compares favorably with that of Western classics in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Moreover, works by exiled or denounced Russian and East-European language authors (Milosz, Solzhenitsyn) which have been suppressed or selectively censored in the East have been published in the West. The volume of "*Tamizdat*," i.e. works by Eastern authors (Iskander, Seifert) which are not publishable at home for political reasons and therefore published abroad, indicates that Western publication of works by contemporary East bloc writers could be much broader if publication were not inhibited by censorship and the Soviet copyright agency VAAP.

In the West, availability of titles from the East is largely dependent on demand. In the East, the number of books printed is so small in comparison to demand that the books sell out immediately. The Soviet Union claims to be the world's largest translator of foreign books, with more than 2,000 foreign authors published every year. However, such translations are selective and tendentious, with large runs of "acceptable" authors such as Twain and London, occasional pieces by contemporary Western writers and nothing critical of the USSR. "When blacklists are taken into account," Gruliow points out, "it may even be said that the American book-buying public has access at any time to a wider range of Soviet and Russian titles than the Soviet book buyer to American."

The Moscow International Book Fair is held biennially. In 1983, US publishers participated in the fair in greatly reduced numbers due to poor book sales and in protest against the Soviet treatment of nonconformist writers. At the 1985 fair, a larger number of American book publishers and distributers were represented at the fair than in 1983. This was due primarily to the participation of the large US book wholesaling firm Baker and Taylor, and, for the first time since 1979, the Association of American Publishers, which mounted a popular exhibit "America Through American Eyes." There was also a continuing presence by a few US trade publishers and by several scientific and religious publishers, such as the Association of Jewish Book Publishers. As at previous fairs, there were controversies, involving visa denials to some US publishers and observers, Soviet confiscation of books and catalogues, and obtrusive Soviet control procedures. Nonetheless, thousands of Soviet citizens had the opportunity to view and read a broad sampling of American books.

The Esalen Institute's book exhibit made a second Moscow appearance at the International Book Fair. As part of its Soviet-American Exchange Program, the Esalen Institute had reached an agreement in the spring of 1984 with the USSR State Committee on Publishing (Goskomizdat) to organize an American book exhibit in the areas of health promotion, psychology and medicine. These reciprocal book exhibitions were accompanied by two or three authors from each country who lectured and conducted seminars on their works and on the literature of their respective countries. Prior to the International Book Fair, the Esalen exhibit had been shown in Moscow and Novosibirsk in January-February 1985 and in Los Angeles and San Francisco in April of that year. Two thousand American books and 1,078 Soviet books were displayed. One set of the Esalen collection was given to the National Library of Medical Sciences in Moscow, another to the National Library of Science and Technology in Novosibirsk.

In January 1986, after nearly 2 years of negotiation, the University of Missouri and Moscow State University signed an agreement authorizing publication by the University of Missouri Press of a book of Soviet-authorized articles each year for at least 3 years. Each annual, which will be entitled "Soviet-American Dialogues on U.S. History," will contain 12 to 15 articles by Russian scholars with critiques by American historians and responses by the Soviet authors. The articles will be an English translation of ones already published in the original in the Soviet Union. The first edition will appear in the spring of 1987.

For 10 days in March 1986, an exhibition of Soviet books on the arts, sponsored jointly by Goskomizdat and the US Congress, opened on Capitol Hill. About 700 publications were displayed, including art books dedicated to the 40th Anniversary of World War II and rare exhibits of 35 books from private collections of Moscow and Leningrad bibliophiles, all published between 1941-45. The exhibit was organized by Goskomizdat and Mrs. Annette Lantos, wife of California Congressman Tom Lantos. The Soviet Union donated the exhibit to the US National Gallery of Art.

In early October 1986, US and Soviet publishing experts met at the Frankfurt International Book Fair in an effort to follow through on opportunities raised by the Geneva summit in 1985. Peter Weidhaas, Director-General of the fair, welcoming the delegations, referred to Article VIII of the Geneva General Agreement on Contacts, Exchanges an Cooperation in Scientific, Technical, Educational, Cultural and Other Fields. Subsequent discussions, led by Dr. Guy Story Brown, Director of the USIA's Office of Cultural Centers and Resources and M.F. Nenashev, Chairman of Goskomizdat, concerned, *inter alia*, the resumption of exchanges of professional and technical information in library science; exploration of exchanging technical information on developments in book manufacturing; increasing the availability of scholarly literature, *via* agreements between US and Soviet scholarly and academic publishers as well as the exploration of specific co-publishing agreements; exchanges geared to training in professional and editorial publishing skills; greater use of book exhibits, increasing the availability of book reviews and amelioration of the barriers of copyright and censorship; exchanges of personnel from publishing industries; and, exchanges of bibliographic information.

In *Romania*, books, usually out-of-date scientific or technical works, are sometimes available in secondhand stores. US books occasionally are found in *Polish* used bookstores. Public and university library purchases of new books and periodicals are severely limited by lack of hard currency. US books and periodicals already in library collections—principally university libraries—are accessible. The US Embassy's efforts to assist publishers effectively have been forestalled by refusal of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to grant the necessary permission. The Embassy produced an historical anthology of American literature, which was printed and bound outside of Poland and has been distributed in multiple copies to university English departments. *Hungary* translates and publishes a large number of books from Western languages into Hungarian.

In the *GDR* about 30 titles each year are translated and printed by government-owned publishing companies, mostly titles in the public domain, but the printings are small and the books often hard to obtain. The US Embassy sends books to recipients in the GDR. The Leipzig Book Fair continues to attract US and other Western publishers. At the 1986 Leipzig Fair, over 8,000 visitors viewed the USIS exhibit.

In *Czechoslovakia*, American books and periodicals generally are not available, although some are available on a restricted basis in technical and university libraries. In recent years, the CSSR Government has not interfered overtly with the operation of the US Embassy Library in Prague, which makes its nearly 5,000 books and 114 current US periodicals in the English language accessible to the public daily. However, the Embassy reports that free access to the library is not facilitated by the presence of armed CSSR guards outside the Embassy and the widespread fear among citizens that they will have difficulties should they be seen to visit the library. American literature in translation can be found at most major bookstores. A number of high-quality US bestsellers do get translated and American fiction is translated regularly in the magazine *World Literature*.

English departments at major CSSR universities maintain collections of US literature but these contain many gaps, particularly in recent American fiction and criticism. Moreover, the departmental libraries are generally open only to faculty members and to students majoring in English. The CSSR state library spends $10,000 annually on US books, but these are mainly technical works and are available only to selected institutions and individuals.

In *Bulgaria*, books by selected US authors are available in translation, but they are not abundant and often are sold out immediately. Some textbooks in English are stocked. In December 1985, the American best books exhibit was shown at the National Library in Sofia for 2 weeks, after which the books were donated to the library.

Filmed and Broadcast Information

The Final Act encourages the participating States to improve the East-West dissemination of information through film, television and radio.

Film

Activity in this area continues to be fostered by commercial and noncommercial distribution arrangements and contracts between competent bodies and enterprises in CSCE states, by co-productions, by contacts and exchanges between film libraries and institutes, among film archivists, cinematographers and scholars and by international film festivals such as the annual Cannes Film Festival. Audiences in Eastern Europe, particularly in Hungary, Romania and Poland, increasingly are well-acquainted with US and other Western films, many of which are broadcast over television. In the United States and other Western countries, museums, film institutes and universities are active in arranging not only individual showings of East European productions, but film series as well.

Hungary received an Academy Award in 1982 for "Mephisto," which was judged the best foreign film. Additionally, the American Film Institute announced in September that, with the USIA's assistance, a series of Hungarian pictures would be presented at college campuses and other locations throughout the United States during 1982-83. Also in September 1982, several US films were shown at Prague's annual "Tourfilm" festival. During September and October of that year, a series of films never before commercially released in the United States and produced by studios in Russia, Georgia and Estonia, were presented cooperatively in Washington, DC by the Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, the American Film Institute, the Smithsonian Resident Associate Program and the Soviet Embassy. Then, in November, again in Washington, a series of recent Soviet movies organized by International Film Exchange Ltd., in association with Sovexportfilm was shown. The series later was screened in New York.

In May 1983, the US Government sent entries to the Tenth International Film Festival of Environmental Films and TV Programs in Prague. That July, noted American director Alan Pakula travelled to the GDR, the USSR, Romania, Hungary and Bulgaria under USIA auspices. In the fall, the Kennan Institute and the Soviet Embassy again cooperated in the presentation of a USSR film series, screened at the National Air and Space Museum in Washington, DC. An 18-month seven-city tour of GDR films, co-sponsored by the American Film Institute and the USIA, was inaugurated in September at the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, DC. In November 1983, there were eight US entries in the Tenth International Scientific Film Festival in Katowice, Poland. Four won festival prizes. Finally, in 1983, the first joint Bulgarian-US production, "The Glory of the Khan" was completed in Bulgaria.

In 1984, Gene Allen, President of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, completed a USIA-sponsored trip to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria and the GDR. In March-April 1984, Tadeusz Szyma, journalist, film critic and member of the editorial board of Poland's *Tygodnik Powszechny* visited the United States to meet with filmmakers, critics and academic philosophers specializing in aesthetic issues. A USIA exhibit, "Filmmaking in America," opened in June in Budapest. A proposal for the exhibit's tour of Bulgaria was rejected by government authorities. Six films produced in the USSR were presented at the National Air and Space Museum in Washington, DC, in cooperation with the Kennan Institute. In October and November 1984, the Baltimore Museum of Art showed four new Soviet films: "I Don't Want to Be a Grownup;" "Jazzmen;" "War-Time Romance," and; "The Youth of a Genius." The festival was sponsored by the Baltimore Friends School, honoring Claire Walker, teacher emeritus and the first American to receive the Pushkin Medal for Promotion of Russian Language Study. In November 1984, William Hanna of Hanna-Barbera Productions visited "Film Polski" studios to explore opportunities for cooperation in cartoon animation. Also in November, Ioan Grigorescu, Vice President of the Romanian Filmmakers Association, visited the United States under the International Visitor Program. Other visitors were Romanian film directors Andrei Blaier and Alexandru Talos.

In February-March 1985, Jozsef Veress, Deputy Director of the Hungarian Film Institute, travelled to the United States under the International Visitor Program. Also in March 1985, a "Festival of the Films of Hungary" began a 10-city tour of the United States. The festival was arranged by Hungarofilm and The American University with assistance from USIA. In the summer of 1985, 14 US films were entered in the Fourth World Animated Film Festival in Varna, Bulgaria. "Video from Russia: The People Speak," a video done by American filmmaker Dimitri Devyatkin in 1985, was shown on many national TV stations in the United States. Devyatkin filmed spontaneous "man-in-the-street" interviews in Moscow, Kiev, Kazan, Ulyanovsk, Leningrad and Volgograd. The Soviet film "Rasputin" was shown in US theaters in 1985. At the Moscow International Film Festival, the official US entry "A Soldier's Story," shared the top prize with a Soviet and a Greek film and received considerable favorable media coverage. A number of other recent American films were shown in Moscow movie theaters during the festival. Marlow Boyer's film *People to People* premiered in March 1986 in Moscow, Leningrad and Tashkent. The film tells the story of a trip by 31 Americans carrying a letter of friendship signed by 42,000 citizens of Seattle to the people of the USSR. It premiered in Washington, DC in November 1985.

In 1986, the US Embassy in Moscow co-sponsored an animated film festival with the participation of two Walt Disney animation artists. The Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies is collaborating with the Soviet Union of Filmmakers on a series of conferences on Soviet and American cinema called "Image Making and Social Impact." The first conference took place in Washington, September 18-19, 1986. The conference was to provide an international forum for scholarly discussion of a variety of topics, and lay the foundation for a permanent exchange of films, filmmakers and scholars. Participants included specialists from the United States, Western Europe and the Soviet Union. In conjunction with the conference, a recent Soviet film was screened on September 18 at the American Film Institute. A parallel event is planned for Moscow in 1987, with a focus on American film.

In October-November 1986, the Smithsonian Institution sponsored a series of films selected from those exhibited at the 1986 Tashkent Film Festival in the USSR. Drawn from recent productions of 19 studios outside Moscow, the films give a display unprecedented in the United States of the Soviet Union's many ethnic and national groups. Simultaneously, the series was offered by the Museum of Modern Art in New York. The Smithsonian series was organized in cooperation with International Film Exchange, Ltd. Accompanying the series, a delegation of filmmakers and stars from Soviet Republics, including director Elem Klimov, recently appointed President of the Soviet Filmmakers Union, travelled to the United States.

Television

The Basket III section pertaining to television pledges the participating States to encourage the "wider showing and broadcasting" of a variety of recorded and filmed information from other signatories and to engage in any cooperative ventures necessary to accomplish this goal. In the reporting period, viewers in most of the Eastern states have gained somewhat broader exposure to US television and feature movies as expansion of their facilities has led to a need for additional program materials.

Unlike radio broadcasting, television programs and feature movies leave editorial control in the hands of the local broadcasters. It is possible to choose among the films and videotapes offered. They can be heavily edited and, in effect, can be subjected to censorship. This all may change with the advent of international satellite television. For example, satellite television has been widely discussed by the Polish official media, which considers private satellite viewing inevitable and have reported that approximately 300 persons in the Warsaw area alone now have the necessary equipment to view direct broadcasts from the West.

A number of US universities have rigged computer-driven satellite dishes to permit tracking of Soviet television programs.

An important avenue for the acquisition of film material for use on national TV programs arises from the inter-connection of Eurovision (the West European broadcasting union) and Intervision (the East European version). Programming available from this source consists mainly of sports, space and international news.

The Gorbachev era has brought intensified Soviet efforts to use advances in communications technology to improve its image and particularly to further its peace campaign in the West. Satellite hookups offer a direct means by which to appeal to large Western publics over the heads of their governments. At the same time, the Gorbachev period has seen Soviet self-criticism of its coverage of events in the West. In May 1986, *Pravda* called Soviet television reportage about the West "monotonous." *Pravda* commentator Dmitri Lyubosvetov wrote, "They rarely tell about the achievements of science and technology, about what effect these have on the ordinary worker in the conditions of capitalism." Soviet coverage of the West generally focusses on the ills of society, such as unemployment, crime, racism and political protest.

For the most part, Western films shown on television or in movie theaters in Eastern Europe are selected either because thay are totally innocuous or because they portray life in the West in a negative light. They are frequently edited to conform to propaganda requirements.

In the United States, television programs from and about the Warsaw Pact countries are still few and far between. US television networks do not routinely air shows produced in foreign countries—whether they emanate from East or West Europe. Given the intense competition among the commercial US networks, and the enormous financial investments at stake, many television executives contend that there is little room left for experimentation with programs that are not geared to the tastes of an American mass audience. Public television executives echo that view.

The number of Western television programs shown to Eastern audiences also is limited by economic constraints. Until 1985, for example, *Romanian* TV showed at least one American film every 3 weeks, and at least one American science item per week. Due to the severe energy crisis in Romania during the winter of 1984-85, Romanian TV cut back its air time to approximately 20 hours per week, a restriction which remains in effect. As a result, opportunities for airing US productions were severely reduced. Due to budget restrictions, the state-owned TV network has not purchased any American productions for several years. Older US films are shown commercially on a regular basis in movie theaters and on TV.

Polish television occasionally shows old American films, although with less frequency than in the past. Although lack of hard currency makes new acquisitions extremely rare, in 1986 Polish television did offer recently a retrospective of four Woody Allen films, and "Frankenstein" and the "Bride of Frankenstein" were shown.

In *Hungary*, USIA TV officials continue to consult with Hungarian TV on cooperative projects and other facilitative assistance.

Eighty percent of the *GDR* public has unhindered access to FRG television. The GDR occasionally will purchase older US feature films for broadcast on television. Some of these films are chosen for their entertainment value. *Bulgarian* TV shows Western programs on a regular basis.

Marking a major breakthrough in satellite transmission, in December 1981, US correspondents were able to transmit live coverage of officially sanctioned events fom Moscow via Soviet satellite. In September 1982, the first simulcast, 2-way satellite hookup between the US and USSR linked the US Festival in San Bernardino, CA with a rock band performance for Soviet youth in Moscow. The event was sponsored privately by Apple Computer and UNUSON Corporation. In May 1983, the US Festival again occasioned a simulcast, featuring Academician Velikov, Vice President of the Soviet Academy of Science, Maurice Mitchell, Chairman of the Board of Encyclopedia Britannica and Director of the Annenberg School of Communications, US Astronaut Rusty Schweiker and Soviet Cosmonaut Vitaly Sevastianov, California Congressman

George Brown and Soviet officials. A simultaneous videocast made in July 1983 at the 13th International Film Festival in Moscow was sponsored in part by the Communications Department of the University of California at San Diego. Festival participants addressed the topic "Children and Film."

Space Bridge, Inc. was organized in September 1983 to encourage and facilitate a series of satellite telecommunications events between the United States and the Soviet Union. A meeting of experts in US-USSR satellite telecommunications was convened by the Institute for Soviet-American Relations (ISAR) and the Esalen Soviet-American Exchange Program in San Francisco in October 1983. Participants included principals in the US Festival, the planners of the Moscow Book Fair Discussion Panel and Space Bridge representatives. Long-term implications and coordination of telecommunications work were discussed and efforts begun to provide negotiating, programming and political guidelines for future activity.

In November 1983, a conference on the Long-Term Worldwide Biological Consequences of Nuclear War was the subject of a telecast via satellite hookup. Soviet and US scientists discussed the conference findings and shared research. Also in 1983 for the series "Inside Story," the Public Broadcasting System aired an Emmy Award-winning 2-part series "Dateline: Moscow" which reviewed US press coverage of the Soviet Union. Anchorman Hodding Carter interviewed former American Moscow correspondents Marvin Kalb, Daniel Schorr, Hedrick Smith and Robert Kaiser, US Ambassador Arthur Hartman, Soviet historian Roy Medvedev, and others. The program was re-broadcast in September 1984. By agreement with Gostelradio, "Inside Story" will present a subsequent series of satellite dialogues between US and Soviet participants on a range of subjects.

In January 1984, the Swedish documentary film "Behind the Threat" was shown in Scandinavia as part of television coverage of the opening in Stockholm of the CSCE Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe (CDE). The program depicted how US and Soviet citizens in two small towns—Ketchum, Idaho and Zibly, Ukraine—view one another's countries and perceive the prospects for international peace.

In March 1984, the head of the 24-hour Cable News Network (CNN), Ted Turner, visited Moscow to begin negotiation of an ambitious agreement involving the exchange of film clips of news and cultural programs between Turner Broadcasting and Gostelradio. By August, CNN had agreed to use the Soviet communications satellite system Intersputnik to broadcast segments of the Friendship '84 Games in Moscow. The scope of the CNN agreements was unprecedented for an American broadcaster.

In a major US-Soviet cooperative effort, in July 1984, NBC began shooting "Peter the Great," a 10-hour miniseries, based on Robert Massie's prize-winning book of the same name. According to executive producer Lawrence Schiller, "Peter" was "the first totally independent American drama ever to film in the Soviet Union." The series was broadcast during the 1985-86 television season. The international, star-studded cast included 21 top Soviet actors trained in English.

In April and May 1984, the Public Broadcasting System screened nationwide an hour-long special documentary "The First Fifty Years: Reflections on US-Soviet Relations." In late September, Metromedia dispatched a film crew to travel throughout the Soviet Union for an hour-long program entitled "Inside Russia."

From September 8 through 16, 1984, NBC aired an extensive series of television broadcasts from the Soviet Union focusing on US-USSR relations and Soviet society entitled "The New Cold War." An accompanying documentary program, "The Real Star Wars," narrated by Marvin Kalb, NBC's chief State Department correspondent, led off the series. NBC radio carried complementary reports. Negotiations for the ambitious project had begun 3 months earlier through conversations between then Soviet Ambassador to the US Anatoly Dobrynin and NBC Network News Vice President Gordon Manning, who subsequently reached an agreement with Gostelradio. Amounting to a total of 8 hours and 10 minutes broadcasting time and shot in 7 Soviet cities, the series primarily was reported by newsanchor Bryant Gumbel on the "Today Program" and chief foreign correspondent Garrick Utley on "Nightly News." Featured were taped interviews with Georgi Arbatov, head of the USSR Institute for the Study of the USA and Canada, Military Chief of Staff Marshall Sergei Akhromeyev and First Deputy Foreign Minster Georgi Kornienko.

On December 13-14, 1984, under the sponsorship of Gostelradio and a US peace group called World Beyond War, a simultaneous satellite bridge connected 4,000 people in the Masonic Auditorium in San Francisco with a similar gathering in Moscow. During the event, World Beyond War presented an annual award to the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, an organization co-founded by Bernard Lown of Harvard University and Evgeni I. Chazov, USSR Deputy Minister of Health, joint 1985 Nobel Peace Prize recipients. In addition, the program was transmitted to another 3,000 people in 12 other US cities. Public Broadcasting System stations and cable networks carried the event live in a number of regions.

On July 4, 1985, US Ambassador to the Soviet Union Arthur Hartman directly addressed Soviet television viewers. Hartman said that American advanced technology had given "business and private citizens instant access to vast quantities of information on which the process of innovation thrives . . ." In August 1985, the USSR aired a TV news-magazine program on Satellite Program Network, featuring TASS correspondent Vladimir Posner. In 1985, USIA TV Deputy Director Richard Levy travelled to Hungary to discuss access to Worldnet products.

In late 1985, the Public Broadcasting Service coordinated a visit of public television executives to the Soviet Union. The trip, intended to provide opportunities for Soviet and East European broadcasters to screen programs from participating countries and to discuss possibilities and procedures for reciprocal program sales and co-financing new productions, led to the negotiation of an agreement for program exchanges with Intervision.

In September 1985, *ABC News* aired the documentary "45/85," a 3-hour history of US-Soviet relations in the 40 years following World War II. The program included an interview with President Reagan and was followed by a special, 90-minute edition of ABC News "Nightline" moderated by Ted Koppel and featuring commentary by Soviet academician Arbatov, Jeanne Kirkpatrick and Alistair Cooke.

The Soviet Government permitted unprecedented coverage of the Reagan-Gorbachev summit in November 1985. At noon on November 21, Soviet television broke into normal programming for a live broadcast from Geneva of the joint appearance of the two leaders. The broadcast, which was unusual for a television system that generally avoids anything unpredictable or spontaneous, showed Mr. Reagan commenting, through a Russian voice-over translation, on his meetings with Gorbachev. In a November 22, 1985 article, the *New York Times* quoted a Muscovite saying: "It is something unbelievable to find the President of the United States on our television. It is even more unbelievable that his appearance was shown without editing, without commentary."

Peace Child, a theatre production originally performed at the Children's Musical Theatre in Moscow featuring Soviet and American child performers, appeared on December 2 on a satellite TV program "In Memory of Samantha Smith," linking Minneapolis and Moscow. The protocol committing to the program was signed by the State of Minnesota and Gostelradio. This was the first satellite link-up between the United States and the Soviet Union to become widely broadcast in both countries. Previously, only individual PBS network stations carried the programs, as opposed to commercial television. The link-ups had been shown on Soviet Central Televisions's First Program during prime time.

On December 16, leading American and Soviet heart specialists held a USIA-sponsored teleconference via satellite. The teleconference, requested by the Soviets, was the third in a series. Previous broadcasts were beamed to Budapest, Hungary and to seven Arab nations. The first of its kind with the USSR, the conference is to be followed by nine others.

On December 29, 1985, the Documentary Guild with Gostelradio jointly produced a Space Bridge dubbed "A Citizen's Summit" conducted by US talk-show host Phil Donahue in Seattle and TASS correspondent Vladimir Posner in Leningrad. Jointly selected Soviet and US participants engaged in open-ended discussions, seeing and talking to each other using large screen television monitors. The program was edited into 1- and 2-hour versions for broadcasting by commercial and PBS stations across the United States.

Finally, in an unusual television exchange, President Reagan and Secretary General Gorbachev extended 1986 New Year's greetings to the Soviet and American peoples. It was the first time that Soviet and American leaders had directly addressed each other's nation since President Nixon visited the USSR in 1972 and General Secretary Brezhnev the United States in 1973.

Following the Chernobyl nuclear accident, TASS correspondent Vladimir Posner made a number of television appearances in May-June during a visit to the United States to arrange a simulcast exchange between citizens of Boston and Leningrad on June 22. The

Space Bridge, dubbed "Citizens' Summit II: Women to Women" again was moderated by Donahue and Posner. It has yet to be aired.

In May and June, the Better World Society, founded by Ted Turner, presented a prime time television series of programs advocating improved US-Soviet relations and an end to the nuclear arms race.

Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. (TBS), the Committee on Physical Culture and Sport of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and Gostelradio jointly organized the "Goodwill Games," a new quadrennial world-class athletic competition of ambitious proportions that took place in Moscow, July 15-20, 1986. Telecasts of the games were available worldwide via syndication, with the Soviet Union providing the 1986 international feed and TBS offering special US coverage.

Cable News Network has reached an agreement with Gostelradio to tap without charge Soviet television news feeds directly from a Soviet satellite. The feeds currently are beamed to Cuba and East bloc nations. The Federal Communications Commission has granted a temporary license allowing the hookup and the US Department of State has reserved the right to revoke permission if it determines the exchange is "inconsistent with the national interest." CNN has yet to complete the earth station to receive the Soviet signals. In a letter to FCC Chairman Mark Fowler in November 1985, Ambassador Lady Dougan, coordinator of the State Department's Bureau of International Communications and Information Policy, wrote that the decision would be based on "a general assessment of our bilateral relations with the Soviet Union, including progress in obtaining reduction of Soviet jamming and granting of appropriate reciprocal media access."

The Esalen Institute's Soviet-American Exchange Program, the American Academy of Arts and Science and Internews hosted a conference and Space Bridge on the theme "Chernobyl and Three-Mile Island: Lessons for the Future" on September 11, 1986 in San Francisco. Participants included representatives from the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the Soviet Academy of Sciences. Journalists and scientists were able to question panelists *via* direct satellite hookups in Washington and several US universities and research institutions. CNN carried the program. BBC-TV will facilitate a European link to the Space Bridge.

Comrades, a 12-part series produced by the BBC for British television, aired on PBS's "Frontline" program in July and ran through September 1986. The program consisted of hour-long profiles of Soviet citizens of varying ages and national backgrounds. Following each of the 12 segments, PBS interviewed the filmmakers and specialists on different aspects of Soviet life who could comment on the content of the programs.

In August 1986, the Reagan administration rejected an NBC proposal based on a Soviet initiative for a series of televised debates by satellite hookup between high-ranking Soviet and US officials, including Secretary of State Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevarnadze, Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr., Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Soviet Marshal Akhromeyev, and Geneva arms control negotiators Kampelman and Karpov. The Soviets had accepted the offer in July. Vladimir Posner, the Soviet's principal anchorman for satellite hookups, commented in an *Izvestia* interview on August 30 (the same day that *US News and World Report* correspondent Nicholas Daniloff was arrested): "US figures are constantly complaining that Soviet people are badly informed about US foreign policy . . . Open and direct debate on foreign policy questions were in the offing, and the peoples of both countries could have drawn their own conclusions regarding the stances of their governments. Could this be what the US-side feared when making its decision?" Deputy State Department Spokesman Charles Redman explained the US refusal as "one of timing . . . While we are engaged in this work program (i.e., preparations for the summit), we believe it would be inappropriate . . . to engage in one-on-one on-the-record debates about these issues before us . . ."

The Daniloff affair cast a long shadow over the Chautauqua town meeting entitled "A Journey in Open Diplomacy" that was held in Jurmala, Latvia from September 15-19, 1986. Daniloff's release from Soviet imprisonment into the custody of the US Ambassador on the eve of the meeting averted the cancellation by several hundred American participants, including several senior Administration spokespeople. The meeting, co-sponsored by the Eisenhower Institute, was a sequel to the US-Soviet meeting at the Chatauqua Conference Center in New York in the summer of 1985. The US delegation led by Ambassador Jack Matlock, National Security Advisor for Soviet Affairs, was to have included, among others, former UN Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick, Richard Perle, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Security Policy and former National Security Adviser Robert McFarlane, all of whom boycotted the conference in protest over Daniloff.

The scheduling of the conference in Latvia met with some reservation by Balts in the United States, who feared participation by US officials might be taken as a step backward from the longstanding US policy of nonrecognition of the forcible occupation of Baltic States by the USSR in 1940. In practice, holding the conference in Latvia gave US officials and nongovernmental Baltic rights groups, many of whom sent representatives to the conference, a platform from which to draw international attention to their cause. During the course of the meeting, US officials protested the harassment of seven Latvian Americans in their party by the KGB. One journalist born in the United States of Latvian parents, said, "books and notes had been stolen from her hotel room and that she had been followed."

The agreement setting the terms for the Chatauqua meeting called for no prior censorship, open press coverage and a commitment to put "as much of the conference as possible" on Soviet television. The town meeting in Latvia marked the first time an uncensored discussion and exchange of views between high-level US and Soviet officials had been conducted before a large audience in the Soviet Union. Approximately 2,000 Soviet citizens heard the differing US and Soviet approaches to arms control and views on Daniloff and human rights. According to participant John Wallach, foreign editor of the Hearst newspapers, for the first time US officials "got equal time on Soviet television, even if the coverage was not quite as objective as some Americans would have liked." Some excerpts from US interventions were broadcast in context on television throughout the Soviet Union, while others were deliberately distorted. Substantial portions of the debates were printed entirely in the Latvian press without comment and shown uncut on Latvian television; in other instances "contentious" remarks were censored.

In a September 25 article datelined Riga for the *Washington Times* about his Chatauqua experience, Ben Wattenberg, editor of *Public Opinion* magazine, observed: "Something strange is going on in the Soviet Union. Their foreign policy hasn't changed since Mikhail Gorbachev took over. They still murder Afghan children. They are still repressive internally. But some new cracks may be appearing in the information curtain . . ." Vladimir Posner, a frequent commentator on US television programs such as ABC News "Nightline," acted as a moderator for the town meeting. He was the only Soviet participant to criticize his government, stating that more Americans should be permitted to appear on Soviet television.

In a novel propaganda move evidently aimed at dissuading Jews and others from attempting to emigrate, on September 21, Soviet television screened an uncensored, uncut US documentary "The Russians are Here," which profiled Soviet emigres in New York. The emigres frankly discussed the difficulties and disappointments as well as the advantages attendant on immigration and adjustment to life in the United States. In addition, they described the frustrations and problems of Soviet life that led to their emigration from the USSR. The program was accompanied by a long commentary by Genrikh Borovik, a Soviet journalist who is known for his critical coverage and commentary on the ills of US society.

In the United States on October 9, PBS aired an hour-long special, "Channel 3, Moscow," sampling domestic Soviet television broadcasts which had been intercepted from a Soviet satellite over the past year. Chiefly a light entertainment show, the program was hosted by political satirist Mark Russell, who interspersed the film clips with wry banter among a panel of Americans knowledgeable about Soviet society. The program offered interesting glimpses of Soviet popular culture and daily life.

With respect to Eastern Europe, in 1982, a bilateral cooperative project between Hungary and the United States focussing on "America in the 1980's" showed in Hungary. Also in 1982, Hungary televised separate interviews with Deputy Secretary of State Kenneth Dam and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Mark Palmer, who gave US views on arms control and other foreign policy matters. A CSCE-related highlight that same year was the balanced coverage of the televised debate in Norway between US CSCE Ambassador Max Kampelman and the Director of the Soviet Institute for the Study of the USA and Canada, Georgi Arbatov. Subjects discussed were the Helsinki process, the situation in Poland and Afghanistan and US-Soviet relations. In August 1983, the cooperative project "USA—A Year Before the Election" aired in Hungary. Later, in September, the visit of US Vice President George Bush was accorded wide media coverage. In November 1984, Mihaly Kornidesz, President of Hungarian Television, visited the United States under the International Visitor Program. He met with US television companies and with the Radio-Television Department of the United Nations. During bilateral CSCE consultations in Budapest prior to the opening of the Vienna Review Meeting of Helsinki signatory states, the head of the US delegation, Warren Zimmermann, was interviewed by Hungary's most prestigious news program, the weekly wrap-up "A Het." A 4- to 5-minute segment of the interview aired October 12, focussing on the pre-Reykjavik atmosphere. The coverage was accurate, balanced and included Zimmermann's remarks regarding the importance of human rights.

In 1986, PBS-TV crew from KCET-Los Angeles spent 6 weeks taping a 1-hour special on the Hungarian Revolution and its 30-year aftermath. Although the topic was sensitive, the project—including spontaneous interviews with everyday Hungarians—went forward as desired by the TV crew.

Radio

Dissemination of information broadcast by radio is encouraged in Basket III of the Helsinki Final Act:

> The participating States note the expansion in the dissemination of information broadcast by radio, and express the hope for the continuation of this process, so as to meet the interest of mutual understanding among peoples and the aims set forth by this Conference.

Yet, interference and jamming of Western radios by the Soviet Union and some of its Eastern neighbors have not only continued, but aggressively intensified following the invasion of Afghanistan and the rise of Solidarity in 1980 in Poland. Jamming of Polish language broadcasts increased in 1982 with the heightening of political tensions. That same year, the Soviet Union began jamming Western broadcasts beamed to Afghanistan. As George Jacobs, a consulting radio engineer and an expert on jamming practices, testified before the Commission on October 29, 1985 at a hearing on Soviet cultural life:

> A chronology of Soviet and East European jamming shows that it has varied in accordance with major changes in East-West relations, and particularly in consonance with crises, internal and external . . . While there have been periods when Soviet jamming has been reduced drastically, the technical apparatus has always remained in place, to be brought back into service on short notice.

East bloc governments justify jamming as a defense against "radio aggression" and "psychological warfare," often accusing the Western radios of being vehicles for subversion by hostile intelligence organizations. They consistently attempt to have foreign broadcasts deemed hostile to their interests banned by international bodies as "interference in internal affairs" or "war propaganda." In September 1982, the USSR Supreme Soviet suddenly ratified the 1936 League of Nations International Convention Concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace. The Convention prohibits radio "war propaganda" or any other information prejudicial to "good international understanding." The East also has exploited the drive by some Third World and Communist countries for a New World Information Order to justify limiting access by their citizens to outside sources of information. At the World Administrative Radio Conferences, held by the International Telecommunications Union, the East consistently encourages Third World countries to press for more broadcasting frequencies in an effort to reduce the allocation of frequencies to U.S. and other Western broadcasters. By reducing the number of frequencies available to Western broadcasters, the task of jammers would be made easier.

In January 1984, the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) convened a World Administrative Radio Conference (WARC), which addressed the problem of "harmful interference" (jamming) to broadcasts. The Conference adopted resolution COM 5/1, which established a world-wide program for collecting monitoring data to document the scope of the jamming problem. The program is managed by the International Frequency Registration Board of the ITU. In September 1986, the IFRB issued a report identifying the USSR, Czechoslovakia and Poland for jamming the shortwave radio broadcasts of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in violation of international agreements. The report had been prepared in response to a request from the US Government after the three countries failed to respond to complaints which the United States had filed in 1984 and 1985. Diana Lady Dougan, coordinator of the US Department of State's Bureau of International Communication and Information Policy, praised the board's report: "We are pleased that for the first time in the long history of Soviet jamming and the even longer history of the ITU, the United States has been able to secure formal recognition by a UN agency of the interference."

The effect of jamming ranges from minor annoyance to total blockage of signal. In major urban areas, the combination of local, ground and sky wave jamming frequently makes listening to a signal all but impossible. Listeners have more success receiving Western broadcasts outside urban areas.

The Soviets jam the major broadcasters of languages native to the Soviet Union, i.e. the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Deutsche Welle and Kol Israel. In January 1987, the USSR ceased jamming the BBC's Russian language service, presumably in advance of Prime Minister Thatcher's 1987 visit. The other BBC language services continue to be jammed, however. Also, the USSR jams foreign broadcasts in the languages of Afghanistan. They have tightened control over public access to shortwave receivers and converter parts in order to limit domestic audiences for shortwave broadcasts and have begun experimenting with digital broadcasting, which, they claim, cannot be jammed. The GDR, Romania and Hungary do not jam Western broadcasts. However, in 1985, Hungary reportedly did interfere with RFE when it ran an interview in Hungarian with former Prime Minister Hegedus, the Prime Minister during the 1956 uprising. Bulgaria is the only East bloc country to jam Radio Vatican. Other stations broadcasting in Bulgarian are jammed, but interference with VOA's Bulgarian language service ceased in September 1983. Poland and Czechoslovakia engage in selective jamming against United States, United Kingdom and Federal Republic broadcasters. In this, they are assisted by Soviet jammers. English-language broadcasts are not interfered with other than by "spillover jamming" from adjacent frequencies.

On the positive side, VOA Director Gene Pell visited Hungary in late 1984. An illustration of cooperative radio programming was the February 1984 audio hookup via satellite between Gostelradio in Moscow and KQED-FM in San Francisco, permitting the transmission of a two-way discussion on "Soviet-American Relations: Perceptions and Misperceptions" as part of National Public Radio's weekly international affairs program. On August 5, 1984, the 39th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima, a live radio network linked citizens of the United States with citizens of Japan, Britain, the FRG, France and the USSR. Billed as the First Global Town Meeting, the program was conceived and organized by Chuck Alton of US Radio. Other such global town meetings are envisioned.

In 1985, before the first summit, the Soviets suspended jamming on three frequencies during a radio broadcast by President Reagan.

Following the Chernobyl disaster, in a live shortwave broadcast by the BBC, listeners around the world were given an unprecedented chance to telephone questions to Georgi Arbatov, a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and head of the USA and Canada Institute in Moscow.

US Information Agency Director Charles Z. Wick has indicated that at the Reykjavik summit he had explored with Aleksandr Yakovlev, head of the propaganda department of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, the possibility of the Soviet Union using commercial American radio stations for propaganda broadcasts if in return the Soviets stop jamming VOA.

The 1987 new year was ushered in by a live simultaneous broadcast of Soviet and American performers on radio stations in each nation. And in March, the 6-part "Moscow-New York Live" radio series was inaugurated with a discussion of "New Ways of Thinking in the Nuclear Age." The highlight of each show is the projected 25-minute, uncensored segment devoted to callers' questions.

Cooperative Efforts in the Field of Information

In conformity with the Helsinki Final Act, the participating States have engaged in a variety of other cooperative efforts in the field of information. At Madrid, the participating States additionally agreed to: "further expansion of cooperation among mass media and their representatives, especially between the editorial staffs of press agencies, newspapers, radio and television organizations as well as film companies; encourage a more regular exchange of news, articles, supplements and broadcasts as well as the exchange of editorial staff for better knowledge of respective practices;" on a reciprocal basis "improve the material and technical facilities provided for permanently or temporarily accredited television and radio reporters;" and, "facilitate direct contacts among journalists as well as contacts within the framework of professional organizations."

Below are some illustrative examples of cooperative efforts in the areas of publishing, journalism and broadcasting.

Private sector interest in the improvement of international understanding through the cooperative exchange of information has been undertaken by the New England Society of Newspaper Editors (NESNE), which sponsors meetings of American and Soviet editors. NESNE inaugurated its program of contacts in August and September 1982 at a meeting at Colby-Sawyer College in New Hampshire attended by representatives of TASS, *Pravda* and other Soviet news organs. At a second exchange held in Leningrad and

Moscow in the summer of 1983, participants laid the groundwork for three journalistic projects: an exchange of columns between the Soviet Novosti Press Agency and NESNE-member newspapers; an exchange of journalism students between Boston University and Leningrad State University; and exchange of young, working journalists from NESNE and Soviet newspapers.

From February 1-12, 1984, Moscow and US-based Soviet journalists traveled to California for meetings with representatives of the Committee of California Print and Broadcast Journalists. The meeting allowed for frank discussion of their fundamentally differing concepts of the role and responsibility of the press. The California Committee and the USSR State Committee for TV and Radio subsequently issued a cooperatively prepared 20-page report on "Soviet-American Media Exchange."

From August 20-26, 1984, NESNE hosted a second conference with seven Soviet colleagues, this time at Brown University in Rhode Island. A reciprocal conference in the USSR took place in the summer of 1985. Some of the US delegates to the conference remained in the Soviet Union for 3 to 6 months on assignment as working reporters to Soviet newspapers. The American Society of Newspaper Editors (ASNE), following the lead of NESNE, began a similar exchange in 1984. Eleven delegates from the USSR Union of Journalists led by Genrikh Borovik, editor of *Teatr Magazine*, came to the United States in June and July. Their schedule included interviews with members of the US administration and Congress, visits to the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, CBS, NBC and a conference with American editors at Princeton. In return, a 13-member US delegation led by ASNE President Richard D. Smyser traveled to Moscow from August 27 to September 6 at the invitation of the USSR Union of Journalists. ASNE participants met with journalists from *Pravda*, *Izvestia*, TASS and Novosti, officials of the USA and Canada Institute and Gostelradio. They also spoke with deputies of the Supreme Soviet, scientists, writers, workers, as well as leaders of the Ukrainian Union of Journalists.

A delegation of editors from US trade union newspapers and journals visited the Soviet Union in May 1985 at the invitation of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions. A roundtable meeting of the Soviet and American trade union journalists on the subject of "The Role of the Trade Union Press in the Struggle for Peace and Cooperation" was held at the AUCCTU. Members of the US delegation, journalists from *Trud* and Soviet sectorial trade union publications, and representatives of *Novosti* and the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting took part in it.

The experience ended on a sour note for some of the US participants in the roundtable. An article written by Mikhail Nakoryakov of Novosti press agency, dateline Moscow, which appeared in the June 8, 1985 issue of the New York *Daily World*, severely distorted and misrepresented the statements of the US participants regarding labor conditions in the United States. Jim Perry, Editor of the "Los Angeles Firefighter," strongly protested the article to Soviet Embassy First Secretary Grigorian and demanded an apology and retraction from Novosti or the *Daily World*. His letter concludes:

"Whoever is responsible for this yellow journalism has done a disservice to the cause of friendship, trust and understanding between us."

In September 1985, 16 American journalists from the US Black Press Institute participated in a delegation to the USSR sponsored by the International Federation of Journalists in Brussels, the International Organization of Journalists in Prague and the Union of Soviet Journalists.

A delegation of California publishers, editors and broadcasters, following up on the 1984 Soviet delegation to California, travelled to Moscow in September 1985 for a 2-week visit.

Following the Geneva summit in November, NESNE received a telex from the Soviet Union of Journalists to proceed on the original 1982 project for an exchange of journalists. The agreement provides for a year's work by two American journalists on Soviet newspapers, and two Soviets on US newspapers.

The Esalen Soviet-American Exchange Program and the USSR Union of Writers sponsored a writers' exchange hosted by Esalen in the United States in July-August 1986. As part of the program, the Soviet participants participated in conversations and seminars with US editors, publishers and writers in New York, San Francisco and at Esalen Institute in Big Sur, CA. Esalen will sponsor a long-term exchange of views between American and Soviet writers, editors and publishers.

In July 1986, ASNE sent 15 newspaper officials to Moscow, Leningrad and Tbilisi for 2 weeks of exchanges with Soviet journalists and editors.

The frameup and arrest of *U.S. News and World Report* correspondent Nicholas Daniloff in late August 1986 provoked angry reaction from the American journalistic community. The 29 US journalists accredited to Moscow signed a letter to Gorbachev expressing their dismay over Daniloff's arrest and detention. The journalists described the KGB action as an attempt to intimidate journalists and as a violation of the Helsinki accords. NESNE, which was to have held its fifth annual conference with Soviet journalists September 14-20 at Middlebury College, VT, postponed the meeting until a time-after Daniloff was freed. As a result, the planned exchange of two American journalists, who were to have spent 3 months working for a Soviet newspaper beginning in September, and of two Soviet journalists, expected to arrive in the United States at the end of the year, was suspended. On September 9, the Associated Press cancelled a planned trip to the USSR. ASNE similarly postponed its activities with Soviet counterparts until Daniloff was released.

On September 22 at the National Press Building in Washington, DC, an unprecedented gathering of the leaders of virtually all US news organizations announced at the National Press Building in Washington, DC that they wanted to go to Moscow to seek Daniloff's release. Michael G. Gartner, president of ASNE, read a telegram from the group to Gorbachev and other top Soviet officials asking permission to send a delegation to the Soviet Union "at the earliest possible date to talk directly to you and other officials about the Daniloff case and questions of journalistic activity in the Soviet Union." The telegram expressed concern regarding the "serious implications of this matter for members of the international press corps who are assigned to cover the Soviet Union."

WORKING CONDITIONS FOR JOURNALISTS

The Final Act asserts that journalists' working conditions can be improved by facilitating the freer movement of journalists, by assisting them in the performance of their work, and by protecting them from government interference and penalties. Over the years, Western journalists in Eastern countries have cited relevant Helsinki provisions when attempting to secure and to exercise their professional rights; journalists also have had frequent occasion to invoke the Final Act when protesting the violation of their rights by Eastern governments.

The Madrid Concluding Document contains additional commitments with respect to the treatment of journalists. The participating States pledged *inter alia* to "decide without delay upon visa applicatons from journalists and re-examine within a reasonable timeframe applications which have been refused; grant permanent correspondents and members of their families living with them multiple entry and exit visas valid for 1 year; examine the possibility of granting, where necessary on the basis of bilateral arrangements, accreditation and related facilities to journalists from other participating States who are permanently accredited in third countries; facilitate travel by journalists from other participating States within their territories, *inter alia* by taking concrete measures where necessary, to afford them opportunities to travel more extensively, with the exception of areas closed for security reasons." Moreover, the participating States agreed to "further increase the possibilities, and when necessary, improve the conditions for journalists from other participating States to establish and maintain personal contacts and communication with their sources."

According to other Madrid provisions, the participating States will "as a rule, authorize radio and television journalists, at their request, to be accompanied by their own sound and film technicians and to use their own equipment;" and, permit journalists to "carry with them reference material, including personal notes and files, to be used strictly for their professional purposes."

Finally, at Madrid, the participating States agreed, where necessary to "facilitate the establishment and operation . . . of press centers . . . open to the national and foreign press" and "consider further ways and means to assist journalists . . . and thus enable them to resolve practical problems they may encounter."

In the area of working conditions for journalists, problems arise from the difference in Eastern and Western perceptions of the role of the news media. The Soviet Union and its close allies have never been advocates of a free press. They hold that information must serve the Socialist state and that the corrupting influence of foreign news organizations must be controlled. Communist ideologists—like Jeffersonians—acknowledge the power of the press, but for different reasons: the former see it as a mechanism for political control; the latter as a source for the free dissemination of knowledge. According to Eastern logic, Western news organizations and their representatives—like their Communist counterparts—are presumed to engage in systematic intelligence gathering.

In the Soviet Union and other East bloc countries, a journalist, in addition to being an employee of the state, traditionally has been employed as an instrument of the state, serving primarily a propagandistic function. Independent, comprehensive and objective news gathering by the press, so highly valued in the West, is intolerable to those governments which endeavor to control completely what their citizens read in the newspapers, watch on television or hear on the radio. Despite the CSCE call for the free flow of information, to varying extents East bloc countries all continue to restrict and penalize journalists who are simply performing their jobs.

US restrictions on and warnings to resident East bloc journalists are based upon strict reciprocity, in retaliation for similar actions taken against American journalists. For example, action on a Soviet application to send a teletype operator to the TASS office in the United States had been held up pending Soviet approval of the longstanding request to establish *Wall Street Journal* (finally granted in August 1986) and *Washington Times* (still pending) bureaus in Moscow. The USSR is the only East European country that continues to deny access to certain closed areas of the country. Consequently, the United States maintains corresponding areas which are off-limits to Soviet journalists.

Consistent with the much heralded policy of "openness" (*glasnost*) espoused by Gorbachev, Soviet officials have made themselves available to *Soviet* and foreign press and discussed previously taboo subjects in a manner that would have been unimagineable a few years ago. Since June 1984, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman and other Soviet officials have held regular briefings for the foreign press. The USSR permitted the rare publication of an interview with President Reagan by four Soviet journalists in the run up to the first summit. In the same timeframe, Gorbachev granted an interview to *Newsweek* magazine. In a departure from usual practice, in February 1986, Politburo member and First Deputy Prime Minister Geidar Aliyev held a wide-ranging news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists on the third day of the 27th Party Congress. In September 1986, reflecting a post-Chernobyl approach to informing the national and international publics about disasters, official media reported the sinking of the passenger ship Nakhimov with uncharacteristic speed and detail and called a news conference less than 48 hours after the tragedy. Other disasters subsequently have been reported, such as the mining disaster in Donetsk in December 1986.

These welcome steps notwithstanding, the Soviet Union has the worst implementation record in the East bloc regarding treatment of journalists. The USSR continues to maintain tight control over foreign journalists and keep them as isolated as possible from the society in which they live and about which their professional duty it is to report. Almost all foreign journalists work in closely watched foreigners-only compounds assigned by the Government. The Soviet citizens who work for them as translators, producers, secretaries, chauffeurs and maids are hand-picked by a special agency of the Foreign Ministry, but actually answer to the police.

This is in direct contravention of Helsinki and Madrid pledges stating that: "the legitimate pursuit of their professional activity will neither render journalists liable to expulsion nor otherwise penalize them." Deliberate Soviet harassment of journalists has been increasing. In fact, the reporting period can be said to have begun with the expulsion from Moscow in August 1982 of *Newsweek* correspondent Andrew Nagorski (for which in retaliation the United States expelled an *Izvestia* correspondent) and to have culminated in the arrest of *U.S. News and World Report* correspondent Nicholas Daniloff on espionage charges in August 1986. In a *Newsweek* article of September 22, 1986 entitled, "Your Accreditation Has Been Lifted," Nagorski described as "psychological warfare" the environment in which foreign correspondents must live in the USSR.

Overt censorship of wire transmission of news stories out of the country is infrequent, but the hostile treatment of selected foreign journalists can only be characterized as crude, politically-motivated harassment. Journalists have been called into the Foreign Ministry and issued warnings for stories that did not meet with Soviet approval. Foreign journalists attempting to make contact with unofficial sources or cover events frowned on by the authorities have been harassed, either by being rebuffed and physically barred from an arranged meeting place by militia or by being called in for questioning as part of the evidence-gathering process related to a criminal court action. Individual correspondents have been threatened with prosecution and imprisonment on trumped-up charges, accosted in the streets, victimized by acts of petty hooliganism such as tire slashings that clearly were orchestrated by the police, attacked maliciously in the press for tendentious reporting, targetted for entrapment and, through other methods of intimidation—often involving mistreatment and interrogation of their Soviet friends and sources—have come under intense pressure to leave the country.

Anne Garrels, Moscow correspondent for ABC from 1979-82, described her "psychological torment" while under investigation in Moscow for homicide following an accident in which a car she was driving struck an intoxicated pedestrian. The KGB exploited the tragedy in a concerted effort to harry Garrels out of the country. In a *New York Times* article that appeared after Daniloff's arrest entitled, "I Was A Victim," she wrote: "Eventually, I was cleared of any crime and soon afterwards expelled." (On May 29, 1982 her credentials were lifted, but she was not formally expelled and she subsequently departed the country—ed.). "But in the meantime, I found myself caught up in a political wilderness where there were no rules, the victim of hints and innuendo . . . The pressure in Moscow was matched by warnings in Washington where Soviet diplomats threatened the future of ABC's Moscow bureau if ABC did not remove me. Blackmail, pure and simple." In the aftermath of the Daniloff affair, on October 3, police detained and questioned the Soviet citizen translator of Canadian Broadcasting Corporation correspondent Michael McIvor. The translator had been sent in McIvor's stead to meet a Soviet visitor who had contacted his office after obtaining his telephone number from the Canadian Embassy. The incident heightened the concerns of the community of Western journalists in Moscow about contacts with unknown sources who could either prove to be legitimate or to be provocateurs.

Journalists carrying material with them for professional purposes have encountered obstacles upon entering and leaving the country. For example, in August 1985, *Christian Science Monitor* correspondent Gary Thatcher was detained for several hours by customs officials in Leningrad when returning to his Moscow post from Helsinki, where he had covered the ceremonies commemorating the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki Final Act. His notes and other materials, including a copy of the Helsinki Final Act, were confiscated. After vigorous protests by the US Consul General, the materials were returned on the following day. However, the official inventory of the seized items that the correspondent had signed had been tampered with to make it appear that fewer items had been taken than was the case.

Two American correspondents were refused entry visas in February 1986, to cover the 27th Party Congress. Other applications for accreditation were buried in the application process. In 1986, the Soviets issued temporary accreditation to VOA correspondents for the first time in recent memory. Four VOA journalists were approved to cover the Tchaikovsky competition and Goodwill Games. The Soviets denied a visa to one of three VOA correspondents scheduled to cover the Chatauqua Conference in Jurmala, Latvia.

Western journalists frequently complain of bureaucratic frustration, obfuscation and misrepresentation in *Romania*. There are no permanently accredited resident US journalists in Romania, but approximately 20 visas per year are granted to American journalists in Romania on temporary assignment. Three nonresident American journalists are accredited to Bucharest, but they are granted only single-entry visas. Romania regards foreign journalists with suspicion and openly seeks to manipulate and control them. A lecture from Romania's national press agency Agerpress on the need for more objective reporting is standard procedure for all incoming Western journalists. While some journalists experience long delays in obtaining visas, others encounter little difficulty. However, in 1985, the representative of a major US daily was told by Romanian authorities that he was *persona non grata*for "anti-Romanian reporting," despite the fact that he had a valid multiple-entry visa. Later, another representative of the paper, as well as a Pulitzer Prize-winning correspondent for another ranking US newspaper, were severely lectured by an Agerpress representative regarding "biased" and "unprofessional" reporting. They were told that they would be barred from Romania if their reporting was uncomplimentary.

Journalists from *Time* magazine and the *Christian Science Monitor* who wrote critical articles on Romania did not receive visas the next time they applied, though their requests never were officially rejected. Program deadlines forced a CBS "60 Minutes" team also to cancel a planned visit when their request for visas remained unanswered for several months. While no American journalists have been expelled from Romania in recent years, a number have been denied reentry, evidently due to Romanian Government displeasure over previous reporting.

Other Western journalists have not fared much better with the Romanian authorities. In January 1986, the Vienna correspondent of Agence-France Presse was banned from Romania for 5 years. A journalist from a respected British magazine has received no reply from Agerpress since first applying for a visa in September 1986.

During the December 1985 visit of Secretary of State George Shultz, the Romanian authorities accommodated a large influx of press. During the visit, Romania broke a longstanding policy by issuing a visa to a Radio Free Europe correspondent. However, Romanian officials discouraged efforts by the journalists to work outside of the official program for the Secretary's visit.

The Romanian Government provides opportunities for journalists to travel but under strictly controlled conditions, usually only to government-approved destinations and always with official escorts. However, correspondents frequently travel unescorted by rental car or public transportation.

The Madrid provision on access to sources notwithstanding, Romanian legal penalties make contacts with foreign journalists prohibitively risky to Romanian citizens. Romanian law requires that citizens must report such contacts and the substance of conversations they have with foreigners.

Some Western news agencies employ Romanian citizens as stringers, hired with Romanian Government approval. There are no problems in obtaining Romanian authorization for radio and television journalists to bring their own technicians, equipment and professional reference material into the country.

There is an operating Romanian Foreign Press Club, at which periodic press conferences are held; otherwise such activities are very rare.

Since the initial years following the imposition of martial law in *Poland*, when Western—and particularly American—journalists were targetted in virulent press campaigns and detained or harassed in their efforts to cover street demonstrations or other opposition events, conditions for journalists have improved considerably.

There have been no expulsions of journalists since January 1983, when UPI correspondent Ruth Gruber was held for 23 hours incommunicado under accusation for having received intelligence materials and abusing her position as a foreign correspondent. The targetting of Gruber apparently stemmed from her contacts with dissidents. The previous week, BBC correspondent Kevin Ruane was expelled in response to a program regarding martial law. The authorities did not prosecute Gruber, claiming she had no criminal intentions. In retaliation, the Polish Press Agency's Washington correspondent was expelled by the United States. On February 3, the Polish authorities closed UPI's Warsaw bureau, but it reopened on April 1 and a new PAP correspondent was accredited to Washington.

Although interviews with government officials must be arranged through the Government press agency "Interpress" and the Foreign Ministry Press Department, resident and visiting American journalists rarely report difficulty in obtaining access to important sources and rank Poland high on the list of East European countries in terms of general access. For the papal visit in June 1983, Polish authorities provided facilities for nearly 2,000 foreign correspondents. The Polish Government press spokesman Jerzy Urban schedules weekly press conferences for foreign correspondents which are well-attended and often include newsworthy announcements and considerable give-and-take.

Foreign journalists may travel freely without prior permission, although many have been stopped by provincial authorities for document checks and inspection on the contents of their motor vehicles. Television correspondents still may be subjected to harassment, including temporary detention and seizure of equipment, when they attempt to cover events considered by the authorities to be sensitive.

Technical equipment is imported without restriction, but technical assistance is not: American television networks are allowed one permanently accredited correspondent as well as an accredited producer. Additional permanent technical personnel, such as film crews, must be hired locally. Polish national employees must be approved and registered with the Foreign Ministry. The authorities continue to harass some news organizations with bureaus in Warsaw by refusing to allow selected employees of these organizations to continue working and rejecting work permit requests for others.

In 1986 the *Chicago Tribune* established a bureau in Warsaw. One delay occurred in the issuance of a visa to a visiting Vienna-based UPI correspondent, who applied for a visa to cover a political trial. Eventually, the visa was issued, in time for the trial. The only visa refusals in 1986 that the embassy is aware of involve a *Voice of America* correspondent who has been denied twice in the reporting period and a *Newsweek* reporter who was denied a visa because he interviewed Solidarity leader Bujak while he was still in hiding. No American journalists have been expelled from Poland during the reporting period, and we know of no delays in issuing visas for visiting correspondents.

There are 16 US journalists and 2 television producers permanently in Poland. They and their families have been issued multiple-entry visas which are now renewable annually, as opposed to the previous requirement for renewal every 6 months.

American journalists visit *Hungary* often have no difficulty getting visas. The Foreign Ministry Press Center, Pressinform, effectively and efficiently assists foreign journalists and is also open to national media. By appointment, foreign journalists also have access to the press center of the Hungarian Journalists Association. The Hungarian press center, Pressinform, exerted special efforts to aid foreign journalists covering US Vice President George Bush's trip to Budapest in September 1983.

Multiple-entry visas were approved in 1982. Journalists occasionally have been denied visas because of contacts with Hungarian dissidents. For example, on December 27, 1982, UK citizen Bill Lomax, a frequent contributor of articles on the political and intellectual opposition in Hungary to *Index on Censorship*, was escorted to the Austrian border following entry to Hungary on a valid visa.

After notifying either a Hungarian Embassy or the Foreign Ministry, radio and television journalists can bring their own technicians and equipment, which must be registered with customs upon entering and leaving the country. They can also take with them reference materials for personal use without interference.

Foreign journalists who seek to establish and maintain personal contacts and communications with official and nonofficial sources rarely encounter difficulties. During the 1985 CSCE Cultural Forum in Budapest, the International Helsinki Federation's "parallel conference," in which many prominent members of the intellectual opposition openly participated, was widely covered by the Western press—including VOA and RFE correspondents—without interference. A RFE correspondent who had covered the Forum returned to Hungary in March 1987 to report on a UN-sponsored Demographic Conference. In September 1986, RFE sent its Rome correspondent to Budapest to cover talks between Catholic representatives and Marxist theoreticians. No areas are closed to travel in Hungary.

The *GDR* accords foreign journalists correct treatment. However, their ability to report on events is hampered by laws (not always enforced) that are designed to limit their ability to travel without prior approval, to make appointments without official permission and to receive needed information.

The GDR grants multiple-entry visas valid for 1 year to permanently accredited journalists and their families. Increasing numbers of US correspondents are given temporary visas, but about one-fifth of these requests are denied. Visa requests are processed without delay. In 1985, an unusually large number of newsmen visited the GDR in connection with events commemorating the end of World War II in Europe. None were refused visas. In 1986, the 11th SED Party Congress and the 25th anniversary of the building of the Berlin Wall account for the small reported increase in temporary visas for US journalists in the reporting period.

All travel outside of East Berlin must be approved by the Foreign Ministry and Western journalists must have Foreign Ministry approval for interviews or any significant contacts. New laws implemented in 1979 provide that GDR citizens may not maintain contact with foreign journalists without approval.

Authorization for radio and television journalists to bring their own technicians and equipment into the GDR has generally been granted. GDR authorities insist that foreign journalists, like other foreigners, are subject to restrictions on the printed material they can bring into the country, but in practice, foreign correspondents experience little trouble in doing so.

In the past year, the United States decided to begin issuing multiple-entry visas to GDR journalists valid for up to 1 year, thus eliminating a longstanding GDR complaint.

An international press center with facilities open to foreign journalists is located in East Berlin. Also, during the Leipzig Fairs a press center is open at the site.

Working conditions for journalists in *Czechoslovakia* are not dangerous, but access to government officials and newsworthy information is sharply restricted. Journalists report that Czechoslovak authorities have become somewhat more responsive in the past few months. Press centers for foreign journalists function in Prague and Bratislava, but the quality of information provided is low.

At present, 11 US organizations are permanently accredited to Czechoslovakia including the Voice of America. (In August 1984, VOA correspondent David Lent was refused permanent nonresident accreditation.) CBS and ABC TV correspondents are currently waiting for permanent nonresident accreditation. In August, the bureau chief of ABC News Warsaw applied for nonresident accreditation but, in general, the Czechoslovak Government has been reluctant to grant permanent accreditation to US television representatives.

The US Embassy in Prague reports that at least two Czechoslovak visas for permanent accreditation were granted during the reporting period, as well as about 2 dozen short-term visas, mainly to journalists covering the Women's Tennis Federation Cup in July. In July 1986, however, a *Washington Post* correspondent was interrogated for 40 minutes by police after he completed an interview with the mother of defector Michal Pivonka, now a US hockey player. There are no resident US correspondents in Czechoslovakia. A step forward was Czechoslovakia's extension from 6 months to 1 year of the validity of journalists' visas.

There are no travel restrictions for accredited journalists except in secure areas. Restrictive conditions have not improved for foreign journalists to establish and maintain personal contacts and communication with their sources. Western journalists are usually able to contact dissidents without official interference, although most, if not all, such contacts are subject to police surveillance.

The Czechoslovak Government permits radio and television journalists to bring their own technicians and equipment but encourages use of locally supplied technical personnel and equipment. Journalists are permitted to carry reference material for professional purposes with them but such material can be and usually is scrutinized by border guards and customs officials on entering and leaving the country. In May 1983, one US reporter from the *New York Times*, who had been issued a Czech visa, was denied entry at Prague Airport, had his visa cancelled, and was compelled to depart the country immediately. The Czech authorities claimed that the reporter had refused to submit to customs formalities. Actually, the reporter had gone through customs, had his bags checked and the books and magazines he was carrying inspected, but he had refused examination of his address book.

Although no US journalist has been expelled during the reporting period, a VOA correspondent, Jolyon Naegele, was detained for two hours during the funeral of Nobel Prize-winning poet Jaroslav Seifert in January 1986. On the same occasion, another correspondent had his film confiscated. A large number of Western correspondents were permitted to travel to Czechoslovakia for the Jazz Section trial in March 1987. Naegele was among the three Western journalists (from VOA, Reuters and Agence-France Presse) given access to the courtroom and the Government made an interpreter available. The trial was considered to be the most significant event in Czechoslovakia in recent years.

Working conditions for correspondents in *Bulgaria* remain poor and journalists continue to be harassed.

Journalists who seek out news beyond State-approved topics are often frustrated by the authorities. A record-breaking number of foreign journalists visited Bulgaria to cover the so-called "Bulgarian Connection" in the aftermath of the assassination attempt against the Pope. The Bulgarians held two full-scale press conferences to refute charges of complicity. Crews from all three major US television networks, and correspondents from virtually every US-based wire service and several major newspapers visited Sofia and were provided adequate facilities and access. ABC was able to arrange a direct satellite hookup. Ruth Gruber of UPI was granted a visa in spite of her prior expulsion from Poland.

Theoretically, all parts of the country are open to journalists. However, journalists who have attempted to cover the treatment of ethnic Turks by Bulgarian authorities or report other information displeasing to the regime, have been detained or had their visas suspended. Visa denials are not uncommon in cases where a journalist's reporting has been considered negative. American journalist Thomas Goltz was denied a visa in November 1986; he had been investigating developments in the Government's campaign to assimilate the Turkish minority.

There are no resident US journalists in Bulgaria. A VOA correspondent is one of the seven US correspondents who have been accredited. Television and film crews are permitted to bring their equipment into the country, as have radio journalists.

The "Sofia Press" organization, which is responsible for arranging appointments for visiting journalists with officials and State-approved spokespeople, charges $200 for 3 days of work.

Conclusion

In the age of satellite communications, video cassette recorders, audio cassettes and international radio, the efforts of East bloc governments to stanch the free flow of information from the West to their peoples are rendered increasingly difficult. While attempting to hold internal audiences captive to a State-controlled media, East bloc propagandists increasingly have utilized advances in technology to project a favorable image to Western publics.

The East's generally restrictive and one-sided approach to the dissemination of information undermines all aspects of the Basket III information provisions. As a result, the few positive developments in the exchange of information between East and West have been heavily overshadowed by strictly controlled, almost nonexistent access to Western newspapers and periodicals; censorship and selective importation of Western books, films and programming; jamming of Western radio stations; and, severe constraints on journalists' activities—conditions which still widely prevail in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union in blatant violation of the Helsinki Final Act and Madrid Concluding Document.

CHAPTER THREE—CULTURE AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES

Introduction

Cultural and educational exchanges with the East bloc countries improved somewhat since the last report in 1982. The agreement with the Soviet Union, which the United States declined to renew in 1979 after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, was renewed in November 1985 at the Reagan-Gorbachev summit meeting in Geneva. An exchanges agreement was finally reached with Czechoslovakia in April 1986 after protracted negotiations. Agreements with Romania, Hungary, and Bulgaria were renewed. Cultural relations with Poland, on the other hand, remained at a low ebb despite the lifting of martial law in 1983, while educational exchanges survived the martial law period relatively untouched. It is expected that cultural relations will improve with the lifting of sanctions against the Government of Poland. No agreement exists with the GDR, but some exchanges took place.

The Final Act recognized that cultural and educational exchanges are an integral part of normal intercourse between states, including those with differing political, economic and social systems. By giving an official stamp of approval to these exchanges, the Final Act provided a new stimulus to increased contacts between East and West. This was especially true in Eastern Europe where, prior to 1975, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and the GDR were unwilling to conduct exchanges with the United States without approval from Moscow. The Helsinki accords provided these countries with the necessary leverage to obtain this approval.

The East and West differ significantly on how exchanges should be conducted. The East regards exchanges as instruments of official policy, to be regulated and conducted by the state under intergovernmental agreements, and to achieve specific political and economic objectives. The West, by contrast, supports the concept that cultural and educational exchanges should be conducted directly between individuals and institutions, with a minimal role for governments. The Final Act, in fact, calls for "direct contacts and communications" among persons engaged in cultural and educational activities. It also provides for facilitation of "freer movement and contacts, individually and collectively, whether privately or officially, among persons, institutions and organizations" of the participating States. The United States strongly believes in open exchanges without the need for state-to-state agreements, and believes this language of the Final Act includes the concept of travel for purposes of private cultural exchanges. The US Government believes exchange programs can help break down barriers, lessen distrust, reduce secrecy, and lead toward a more open world.

Cultural Exchanges

SOVIET UNION

A new bilateral exchanges agreement with the Soviet Union was signed at the Geneva summit meeting on November 21, 1985. The previous agreement expired in December 1979. The United States declined to renew the agreement after the Soviets invaded Afghanistan that year. The new agreement is expected to encourage expansion in exchanges in the coming years. Also at the Geneva meeting, President Reagan and Soviet leader Gorbachev signed a statement endorsing several people-to-people exchange programs.

From the expiration of the exchanges agreement at the end of 1979 until the signing of the new agreement in November 1985, bilateral cooperation in the field of culture was at a low level. There were no official exchanges of cultural presentations. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan had seriously undermined the basis for cooperation with the United States in other areas. Nevertheless, the US Government did continue to support certain academic exchanges and several privately administered university-to-university exchanges.

Even during the period when no exchanges agreement was in effect, Americans nevertheless participated on a private basis in most international fairs and festivals each year, including the Moscow Film Festival and the Moscow Book Fair, but at levels lower than in the 1970's before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Other Americans traveled to the USSR to see Soviet performances or meet with counterparts. Although Soviets were invited to the United States for similar purposes, they were often not permitted to accept such invitations. Moreover, Soviet authorities sometimes substituted their own choice.

There were a few signs of an expansion of activity in the cultural field in the months before the signing of the new agreement. In November 1984, singer John Denver gave a series of concerts in Moscow and Leningrad. A group of young rock singers, the Herreys, gave 25 sold-out concerts in several Soviet cities in 1985. The American Council of Young Political Leaders sent a delegation to the Soviet Union in 1985 to explore possibilities for further exchanges, and a Soviet delegation visited the United States to continue these discussions. A few American artists performed at official US residences in Moscow and Leningrad for private audiences that included citizens of the Soviet Union. Soviets also viewed feature films at American residences. However, the range of these activities remained narrow, and Soviet authorities continued to block efforts to extend American cultural programs beyond the confines of official US premises. The Manhattan String Quartet performed several concerts in Moscow and Leningrad in November 1985, but was denied access to larger halls because of the absence of an agreement.

Cultural activities increased sharply after the signing of the new agreement, although many projects remain only under discussion. Principal events under the new agreement were the concert tour in the Soviet Union by pianist Vladimir Horowitz in April 1986, the 3-city tour of the United States by the Kirov Ballet in May 1986, a week-long run of "Rag Dolly" in January 1986 at the children's musical theater in Moscow by a company from the State University of New York at Albany, a US tour in May 1986 by the Moscow children's musical theater, reciprocal art exchanges during February to June 1986 between the National Gallery of Art in Washington and both the Pushkin Museum in Moscow and the Hermitage in Leningrad, and a US tour by the Moiseyev Dance Co. in September 1986. In addition, the Goodwill Games—organized by Turner Broadcasting of the United States and supported by advertising by many large US corporations—were held in Moscow in July 1986; Americans and Soviets were among the 3,000 athletes from 700 participating countries in 18 sports. The Bolshoi Ballet is expected to tour the United States in the summer of 1987.

In February 1987, Elem Klimov, head of the Soviet filmmakers union, announced all of Frederico Fellini's films would be shown in the Soviet Union, along with Milos Foreman's "One Flew Over the Cuckoo's Nest" and "Amadeus." And in March 1987, an exhibit of 115 paintings of Andrew, N.C., and James Wyeth was enthusiastically welcomed in Leningrad. A painting of ballet dancer and defector Rudolf Nureyev was barred from the exhibit, however.

Despite these developments, there remained considerable unfulfilled promise in US-Soviet cultural relations, and it is still unclear whether the Ministry of Culture will widen the scope of what it considers permissible foreign cultural presentations.

Access by Soviet citizens to foreign culture remains tightly controlled. The selection of foreign books for publication and foreign films for showing has been highly restrictive, eliminating those critical of the Soviet Union and stressing those which show the United States in a bad light. Soviet authorities also determine which books may be shown at book fairs. At the Moscow Book Fair in 1983, for example, Soviet officials seized 49 books off the stand of the American Jewish Publishers. In 1985, the US committee selecting books for exhibit at the Moscow fair exercised self-censorship. The committee assembled its books "recognizing the realities of the situation in Moscow. You don't put a lot of books on the list that the Soviets cannot accept," a committee spokesman said. Congressional funds were withdrawn because of the apparent lack of balance in types of books selected to portray life in the United States.

BULGARIA

Cultural relations with Bulgaria are governed by a bilateral exchanges agreement signed in 1977. The most recent 2-year implementing program under the agreement was signed in December 1984 to cover 1985 and 1986.

Problems over the interpretation of the exchanges agreement have had a negative impact on cultural ties. Bulgarian officials attempt to read strict interpretations into the agreement in order to prevent direct contact between the US Embassy and Bulgarian cultural and media institutions. Contrary to the agreement, the Bulgarian Government refused in 1985 to permit the showing of a US exhibit of filmmaking. The authorities continue to obstruct US exchange visitors with bureaucratic hassles, although this problem has abated recently. Also, the authorities still discourage Bulgarians from visiting the press and cultural section of the US Embassy by stationing policemen prominently at the Embassy entrance. Nevertheless, curiosity about the West, and the United States in particular, has attracted a growing number of visitors.

Despite these problems, an exhibit by USIA about American theater enjoyed a successful showing in 1984. A film was produced jointly with Bulgaria in that country in 1983, and a Bulgarian film was screened in Washington under the auspices of the American Film Institute. The United States has successfully sponsored book and folk art exhibits in Bulgaria. The US Embassy has been able to increase the number of visits to Bulgaria by American speakers on topics of mutual interest. And distribution of the US-produced Bulgarian-language magazine *Spektur* increased to 8,000 copies per quarter.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In April 1986, Czechoslovakia and the United States signed a cultural agreement, the first such agreement between the two countries. A program of specific exchange activities for 1986 and 1987 was also signed which provides for cultural cooperation in the areas of fine and performing arts, film and television. The agreement makes possible expanded access to Czechoslovak scholars, artists, and scientists as a useful step in broadening contacts with the country's intellectuals and the public at large. The agreement also calls for both countries to facilitate and encourage exchanges outside of those directly funded by the two governments. There is no evidence to date that institutionalization of exchanges under the new agreement will assist Czechoslovak cultural figures to alleviate the country's restrictive and repressive cultural regime. Czechoslovak authorities can be expected to retain rigid control over types of exchange programs and their participants.

Czechoslovakia was reluctant to broaden cultural exchanges with the United States before 1975, when the Helsinki Final Act was signed. Negotiations for an agreement began soon after the signing of the Final Act, but soon bogged down. A major obstacle to reaching the cultural agreement was removed in 1981, when an agreement was reached permitting return to Czechoslovakia of gold seized by the Nazis and held by the United States. In return, the Czechoslovak Government agreed to settle American financial claims arising from confiscation of US property. After 1981, the US Government—following the imposition of martial law in Poland that year—divided the East European countries into two categories, with Czechoslovakia in the more repressive group, which was deprived of favorable treatment.

In November 1985, the renewal of the US-Soviet cultural agreement at the Geneva summit meeting seemed to have spurred interest in Czechoslovakia in widening ties. Before the agreement was signed, bilateral cultural activity was at a low level. However, some exchanges did take place despite the absence of the official sanction of a formal agreement. American artists performed in Czechoslovakia without difficulties with the authorities. US specialists visited Czechoslovakia under USIA sponsorship for lectures and meetings with colleagues in several fields. An exhibit on the US space shuttle shown in the US Embassy in 1983 drew a large attendance. A Czechoslovak exhibit that opened in Washington in November 1983 completed a 6-city tour of the United States in 1985. The state museum loaned a rarely-seen Titian painting during 1985 to the National Gallery of Art in Washington. By 1985, the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs began to approve an increasing number of visits by American specialists under US sponsorship. Czechoslovak authorities approved an American art exhibit at a Prague museum. They permitted the well attended computer exhibit at the US Embassy library. An architecture exhibit by USIA received the cooperation and co-sponsorship of the authorities. Czechoslovaks also participated in multi-regional projects in libraries and literature.

The Czechoslovak Government permits but makes little effort to encourage the publication and dissemination of written works from the United States. Although American literature in translation can be found in most major bookstores, the books available seem to be selected to give a negative picture of life in the United States.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Cultural relations with the GDR during 1982-86 were limited. No bilateral agreement on cultural relations exists. The United States is required to arrange all cultural programs through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a procedure that delays and confuses arrangements. The East German Government continues to assert that cultural relations should be arranged under a bilateral agreement and that ad hoc arrangements outside of such an agreement are much less acceptable and more difficult to arrange.

The United States continues to have only limited success in arranging visits by specialists, participation in fairs and film showings, or exchanges of performing artists. The East German Government hampers access to the US Embassy and library by stationing guards at the entrance to check identification documents. Only persons with the permission of the East German Government may attend film showings at the US Embassy in Berlin.

US cultural figures have not been able to address general audiences or to lecture at universities except under university-to-university agreements. The United States has regularly assisted with the scheduling of lectures for East German writers, filmmakers, and musicians in the United States, including financing in some cases. There have been no equivalent programs in the GDR because the foreign and cultural ministries have been unwilling or unable to set them up.

Americans occasionally participate in East German cultural festivals on a commercial basis. There are no performing arts exchanges, but some travel of performing artists is arranged through the US-GDR friendship society. Several private arrangements for exchanging publications also exist.

The GDR carefully controls access by its citizens to Western cultural figures and events. All cultural offerings must be approved by state authorities—on political and ideological grounds—before being made available to East German audiences. The East German Government forbids the circulation of all unapproved books, films, publications, and other forms of cultural expression. It facilitates and subsidizes only those elements of foreign cultures that it considers favorable to its world view.

HUNGARY

Cultural programs with Hungary during 1982-86 expanded steadily. Cultural relations are governed by a bilateral agreement signed in 1977. The most recent implementing program under the agreement was signed in January 1986. Quotas specified in the programs are often exceeded. Private exchanges, too, have shown modest but steady growth. Notable recent exchanges include an American filmmaking exhibit shown in four cities in 1985 and a Hungarian exhibit of gold and silver treasures which has appeared in the United States in 1986-87. American artists continue to perform at music festivals in Budapest.

Hungary permits some access to Western literature, films, television programs, and nonpolitical publications. Some Western periodicals are available for local currency. Western radio broadcasts are not normally jammed.

POLAND

Cultural contacts between the United States and Poland were at a fairly low level during 1982-86 because of strained political relations arising from Poland's imposition of martial law in December 1981 and its banning of the Solidarity Free Trade Union. Some traditional US-Polish cultural exchange programs begun before the imposition of martial law have not yet returned to significant levels of activity despite the lifting of martial law in July 1983 because cultural oppression remained and suppression of Solidarity continued. It is expected that cultural contacts between the two countries will improve now that sanctions against Poland have been lifted.

Official US cultural programs were subjected to pressure by the Polish authorities during the 1982-86 period The Polish Government demanded in April 1983 that the US Embassy library prohibit attendance by Poles at film showings and stop lending books to Poles. Visitors to the libraries and cultural offices of the US Embassy and consulates were subjected to document checks and interrogations. Although the US Embassy was allowed to host a public film showing in a Polish cinema in March 1984 and Polish academic and intellectual figures were permitted to attend two large Embassy receptions in honor of the Salzburg seminar program, such social contacts with US Embassy personnel are still largely discouraged.

However, Poland continued to send orchestras and present art exhibits and other such cultural attractions in the United States through nongovernmental organizations. American artists continued to visit Poland, and Poles continued to visit the United States, under private arrangements. The Polish shortage of hard currency to pay Western performers kept the number of American artists at a low level, but there was a slight increase in cultural contacts during 1986.

The Polish authorities attempt to maintain control over the country's cultural activities. In response to the actors' boycott of television and radio during the period of martial law, the authorities publicly criticized actors, dissolved their union, fired some theater directors, dissolved a theater, and transferred control of some theaters to the Ministry of Culture.

Poland prohibits distribution of USIA's Polish language quarterly, *Ameryka*. A few American books are published in translation, but lack of hard currency to purchase rights continues to be a problem. A historical anthology of American literature was printed outside Poland and distributed to university English departments. Polish press articles in 1986 have mentioned the need to concentrate on publishing works from the Communist bloc and to spend less on disseminating books from the West.

ROMANIA

Bilateral cultural activity—governed by the 1975 exchanges agreement and an agreement establishing the American and Romanian libraries in the two countries—was generally moderate but steady during 1982-86. A record 80,000 Romanians attended a US theater exhibit in Bucharest in October 1984. Access to film showings and exhibitions at the American library was generally unimpeded, although too frequent visitors were questioned and discouraged by authorities. Closed-circuit television displays in 1985 outside the US Embassy drew large crowds and, in the beginning, no objection from the authorities. Later, viewers were restricted to a distance of 15 feet from the display on "security" grounds. An American theater exhibit had a highly successful run in Bucharest and then in two major provincial cities in 1985. A US photo exhibit was accepted by the modern art museum in Bucharest in 1986 for the first time.

Romanian compliance with the Final Act's provisions on translation, publication, and dissemination of written works from other states was poor. Foreign exchange shortages and rigid ideological controls make it unlikely that Romania will promote dissemination of books, films, and other forms of cultural expression. However, foreign cultural centers and libraries enjoy open access to the public and are allowed to distribute limited quantities of Western periodicals.

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES

Educational exchanges have continued between the United States and both the Soviet Union and the East European countries despite the deterioration in relations which followed the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, the imposition of martial law in Poland in 1981, and the Soviet shootdown of a South Korean airliner in 1983. This reflects the importance all these countries attach to educational exchanges, which have existed for more than 25 years.

Participation in educational exchange programs, which dropped in the years after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, have risen again to about 60 exchangees per side annually. Late placements, delays in visa issuances, and lack of housing continued and sometimes led US candidates to withdraw. Difficulties in obtaining access to research materials or professional travel for consultations often diminished the quality of in-country programs. Soviet sponsors continued to have difficulty in getting Soviet clearances for their own grantees to travel, with the result that many Soviet scholars arrived late in the United States and some withdrew at the last minute. Unexplained Soviet rejections of US nominees for the Fulbright program and last-minute withdrawals of Soviet candidates without explanation kept the number of participants below the 15 per year which was normal before 1979.

The new cultural and educational exchanges agreement signed in November 1985 outlined a variety of new procedures designed to strengthen and expand the rights of American scholars in the Soviet Union. The principle of reciprocity was underlined in February 1986 by the US withdrawal of an American scholar who was denied appropriate access to research materials, and by the subsequent expulsion of a Soviet scholar from the United States.

Many private exchanges between US and Soviet universities continued during the period. About 250 Russian-language students and teachers of Russian, study in the Soviet Union annually on summer, semester, or year-long programs. A much smaller number of Soviet English-language teachers traveled to the United States on government-supported and private exchanges. The Soviet Union cancelled one such program—with the American Field Service—after the Soviet shootdown of the Scuth Korean airliner in 1983. Discussions for resumption of the agreement began after the new bilateral exchanges agreement was signed in November 1985.

Bulgaria has shown increased interest in student exchanges. For the first time, the exchanges agreement provides for an exchange of graduate students. Private educational exchanges have taken place without official US involvement. Bulgaria participates in the Fulbright program, but most private exchanges involve only short-duration visits by scholars.

Regarding *Czechoslovakia*, the new exchanges agreement signed in April 1986 provides for an expansion of the Fulbright program to three lecturers in language and literature from each side for a full academic year and up to nine lecturers and researchers in other fields for at least one semester. Access to archives and libraries during 1982-86 was not a major problem for American exchangees. A provision on access for scholars is included in the new exchanges agreement. Exchanges under the IREX program did not increase significantly, but an IREX delegation visited Czechoslovakia in November 1985 to discuss possible expansion in several fields. No expansion is planned for the English teaching seminars held in Czechslovakia each summer, in which five American lecturers participate with US Embassy support. A tightening of Czechoslovak visa policy beginning in 1981 adversely affected US-Czechoslovak scholarly exchanges when the authorities began denying visas to US citizens born in Czechoslovakia. Several previously approved exchanges were prevented from going forward in 1982. This policy of close scrutiny and frequent refusal of visa applications by former citizens of Czechoslovakia remains in effect. Its impact on educational exchanges is hard to measure because the number of persons discouraged from applying for exchange programs is unknown.

In the *GDR*, the United States has no governmental programs in educational exchange. American academic exchange programs there are organized under the IREX program, as direct university-to-university programs, or under the exchange agreement with the National Academy of Sciences. The American institutions have expressed an interest in expanding these programs, but they have been critical of the East German Government's efforts to keep American participants separate from their East German colleagues and distant from their East German students. The Government of East Germany has provided access to libraries and archives, except those under the control of the Ministry of the Interior, which has major historical buildings. Scholars not under IREX programs or university-to-university exchanges seldom are able to arrange access to East German materials. The GDR's Government recently accepted the US proposal to establish a small Fulbright program; implementation is expected soon.

In *Hungary*, there was increased interest in academic exchanges. The number of Fulbright lecturers has increased to four each way since 1984, even though the formal program still provides for only two. A program for six post-graduate students each way for a full academic year was added in the program for 1986-88. Private university-to-university exchanges are also expanding, with the full cooperation of the Hungarian Ministry of Culture. The chair in American studies is in its third year at the university in Budapest. Hungarian interest in the International Visitor Program remains high, as does the quality of grantees.

In *Poland*, both the official Fulbright and IREX programs and private academic exchanges remained active and constant during 1982-86, with some increase over earlier periods. The 1981-83 period of martial law did not significantly affect the education programs, as it did cultural exchanges. The program in Poland remained the highest overall in Eastern Europe. Conditions for American students at Polish universities were not oppressive. The students had no problems with access to open archives. However, the Polish Government continues to forbid Poles to participate in the International Visitor Program sponsored by the US Government.

In *Romania*, the Ministry of Education was obstructionist in dealing with the needs of American scholars. American researchers continued to experience unreasonable delays in getting access to research and archival materials. Romania allowed its quotas for study in the United States to lapse barely touched because the teaching load and length of the school year in Romania does not allow enough time for professors to undertake lengthy research projects abroad.

CONCLUSION

Government-sponsored cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union, which were curtailed in 1979 and 1981 because of the events in Afghanistan and Poland, began to improve during the latter part of the 1982-86 reporting period, especially with the signing of the new exchanges agreement in November 1985. Although cultural relations with Poland were adversely affected by the imposition of martial law and have not improved markedly despite the lifting of the martial law regime in 1983, it is hoped that this will change as a result of the lifting of US sanctions against the Government of Poland. Exchanges with the other East European countries continued on a fairly normal course during 1982-86 despite the deterioration of relations with the Soviet Union and Poland. Continuation of relations at some level even during periods of tension such as those following the events in Afghanistan and Poland demonstrates the value attached to these exchanges by all parties. Educational exchanges were largely unaffected by political tensions. Likewise, exchanges by nongovernmental organizations and their counterparts in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe weathered the political storm well. There is still much more room for expansion of cultural and educational exchanges, and many problems remain regarding such matters as access to research materials, access to cultural centers, bureaucratic difficulties, dissemination of foreign literature, and treatment of cultural minorities.

CHAPTER ONE

FOOTNOTES AND SOURCES

Czechoslovakia

[1] U.S. Department of State, Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1985 (Washington, D.C., February 1986), p. 956.

[2] The English translations of the Document of Charter 77 to the Bern CSCE Meeting on Human Contacts (May 21, 1986) and subsequently cited Charter 77 documents were provided by the Committee for the Support of Human Rights in Czechoslovakia.

[3] Charter 77 Document No. 21/86, "Internal Rules in Establishments and Enterprises Must Not Retrench Civic and Political Rights of Employees" (August 15, 1986).

[4] Statistics based on information in the Fifteenth through Twenty-first issues of U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Semiannual Report: Implementation of the Helsinki Final Act (December 1, 1982 - April 1, 1986).

[5] Ibid.

[6] "The Right to Travel Czechoslovak Style," Radio Free Europe, Czechoslovak SR/13 (11 July 1984), p. 4.

[7] Charter 77 Document No. 21/86, op. cit.

[8] Charter Document No. 25/85, "Open Letter to Prime Minister Strougal" (October 1985).

German Democratic Republic

[9] Emigration statistics provided by the U.S. Embassy, Berlin.

[10] Ibid.

[11] The International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, Violations of the Helsinki Accords Since Madrid, Vol. I (Vienna, May 1985), p. 37.

[12] Statistics provided by the U.S. Embassy, Berlin.

[13] International Society for Human Rights, CSCE and Human Rights: Divided Families and the Denial of Freedom of Movement (Frankfurt am Main, March 1986), p. 18. The German-based ISHR found that in 1982, 72 percent of the political prisoners released into the FRG whom it surveyed had been imprisoned due to escape attempts, but in 1984 this figure decreased to 30 percent. The opposite was true of sentencing in connection with efforts to emigrate legally. While the percentage of

those who were imprisoned for filing emigration applications constituted 15 percent in 1982, it rose to 55 percent in 1984. Also, Robert J. McCartney, "Germanys Seek to Benefit from Apparent Thaw," The Washington Post, March 18, 1987, p. A17.

[14] U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Seventeenth Semiannual Report: Implementation of Helsinki Final Act (April 1, 1984 - October 1, 1984), p. 7.

[15] U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Twentieth Semiannual Report: Implementation of Helsinki Final Act (October 1, 1985 - April 1, 1986), p. 7.

Hungary

[16] "Human Rights in Eastern Europe: Restrictions on Travel and Contacts," Radio Free Europe, (11 Apr 86).

[17] Ibid.

Poland

Sources Fourteenth through Twenty-First Semiannual Reports (covering the period December 1, 1982 through October 1, 1986) on Implementation of the Helsinki Final Act, U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Washington, D.C.

Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for the years 1982 through 1985, U.S. Department of State, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Testimony of Felice Gaer, Executive Director, International League for Human Rights before the CSCE Commission, Hearing on Implementation of the Helsinki Accords: Soviet and East European Emigration Policies, April 22, 1986, pp. 32-33, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1986.

Romania

[18] "The Right to Leave: East European Emigration Policies," Statement by Felice D. Gaer, International League for Human Rights, in Hearing before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe on Soviet and East European Emigration Policies, April 22, 1986 (Washington, D.C., 1986), p. 38.

[19] Ibid.

[20] U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, Twentieth Semiannual Report: Implementation of Helsinki Final Act (October 1, 1985 - April 1, 1986), p. 27.

[21] Statistics based on U.S. Department of State, Semiannual Report(s): Implementation of Helsinki Final Act, op. cit (December 1, 1982 - April 1, 1986).

Soviet Union

[22] "Appeal from 140 Refuseniks in the USSR" to the delegates of the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, February 1986, p. 2.

[23] *Human Contacts, Reunion of Families and Soviet Jewry,* Institute of Jewish Affairs, London, 1986.

[24] Thomas M. Magstadt, "Emigration and Citizenship: Implications for Soviet-American Relations," *Policy Analysis,* May 2, 1986.

[25] "Appeal from 140 Refuseniks...", *op. cit.*, p. 3.

[26] U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, *Implementation of Helsinki Final Act: Twentieth Semiannual Report (October 1, 1985 - April 1, 1986),* p. 22.

[27] U.S.Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs, *Implementation of Helsinki Final Act: Sixteenth Semiannual Report (December 1, 1983 - March 31, 1984).*

[28] *Human Contacts*...*op. cit.*, p. 31.

[29] "Appeal from 140 Refuseniks,...", *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[30] "Soviets Get Tougher on the Refuseniks," William Korey, *Wall Street Journal*, June 18, 1986.

[31] Professor Sidney Heitman, "German and Armenian Emigration from the USSR," *Soviet and East European Emigration: Hearing before the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe*, Washington, D.C., 1986, p. 53.

[32] *The Promises of Helsinki: Relative-to-Relative Visits*, Visits International for Soviets and Americans (VISA), 1986, p. 1.

[33] *Report to the CSCE Experts Meeting on Human Contacts*, World Federation of Free Latvians, April 1986, p. 14.

[34] *USSR News Brief*, Cronid Lubarsky, ed., May 15, 1985.

[35] *Human Contacts* ... *op. cit.*, p. 17.

[36] *Report on Basket III Violations of the Helsinki Final Act*, February 1986, Committee of Concerned Scientists, Inc., p. 6.

CHAPTER TWO

Sources The Commission's The Helsinki Process and East-West Relations: A Report on the Positive Aspects of the Implementation of the Helsinki Final Act, 1975-1984, March 1985, served as a conceptual framework and a primary source for this Chapter.

Factual material also extensively was drawn from U.S. State Department Semiannual Reports, numbers Fourteen through Twenty-One (covering the period December 1, 1982 through October 1, 1986), on Implementation of the Helsinki Final Act, Bureau of Public Affairs, Washington, D.C.

For the topic Oral Information, The United States Information Agency provided current statistics on the American Participant Program and the International Visitors Program.

Regarding Printed Information, the publication Soviet-American Cultural Exchanges: Ripoff or Payoff? by Yale Richmond, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, November 1984, proved extremely helpful.

Substantial material on Filmed and Broadcast Information as well as Other Cooperative Efforts in the Field of Information was gleaned from issues of Surviving Together: An Update on Soviet-American Relations, a publication issued periodically by the Friends Committee on National Legislation (FCNL) and the Institute for Soviet-American Relations (ISAR), Washington, D.C.

Information on Jamming was drawn in large part from the testimony of George Jacobs, P.E., Consulting Radio Engineer, at the CSCE Commission Hearing on Soviet Cultural Life, October 29, 1985, Washington, D.C.

COMMISSION ON
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
237 HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING ANNEX 2
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

(202) 225-1901

STATISTICS ON EMIGRATION FROM THE USSR

JEWISH

1965 - June 1967...4,498
Oct. 1968 - 1970...4,235
1971..13,022
1972..31,681
1973..34,733
1974..20,628
1975..13,221
1976..14,261

1977...16,736
1978...28,864
1979...51,320
1980...21,471
1981....9,447
1982....2,688
1983....1,314
1984......897

1985...1,140
1986.....914
Jan 1987......98

GERMAN EMIGRATION TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

1970.....340
1971...1,145
1972...3,423
1973...4,494
1974...6,541
1975...5,985
1976...9,704

1977....9,274
1978....8,455
1979....7,226
1980....6,954
1981....3,773
1982....2,069
1983....1,447

1984...913
1985...460
1986...753

DIRECT EMIGRATION TO THE UNITED STATES*

1970.....250
1971.....300
1972.....500
1973.....750
1974...1,000
1975...1,100
1976...2,600

1977....2,000
1978....1,700
1979....3,600
1980....6,109
1981....1,903
1982......339
1983......311

1984...181
(88 Armenian)

1985...197
(109 Armenian)
1986...350
(247 Armenian)

* These figures include persons who presented Soviet travel passports to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow or who were stateless residents of the U.S.S.R. These figures do not fully reflect the number of Soviet citizens who come to the U.S. seeking permanent residence. Many Soviet citizens choose to come to the United States even though they have left the U.S.S.R. for visas for Israel.